

JPRS-UPA-89-049  
4 AUGUST 1989



**FOREIGN  
BROADCAST  
INFORMATION  
SERVICE**

# ***JPRS Report***

**DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A**

Approved for public release;  
Distribution Unlimited

## **Soviet Union**

***Political Affairs***

19980616 057

REPRODUCED BY  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
NATIONAL TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICE  
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

**DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 6**

# Soviet Union

## Political Affairs

JPRS-UPA-89-049

### CONTENTS

4 AUGUST 1989

#### PARTY, STATE AFFAIRS

Problems Confront 'New Soviet Federation' [POLITICHESKOYE OBRAZOVANIYE No 7, May 89] .....	1
New Ministers Appointed in RSFSR [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 27 Jul 89] .....	8
CPSU's Far East Election Defeats Viewed [Yu. Strugov; SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA, 21 May 89] .....	8
Kazakh CP First Secretary Kolbin on Restructuring [G.V. Kolbin; KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA, 19 May 89] .....	9

#### RELIGION

Ukrainian Exarch Speaks Out Against Uniate, Ukrainian Autocephalous Churches [V. Karpiy; SILSKI VISTI, 19 May 89] .....	21
Industries, Offices To Make Way for Church, Cultural Preserve [A. Vyatkin; SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA, 24 May 89] .....	23
Ivano-Frankovsk Officials Impede Practice of Religious Faith [V. Semotyuk; ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 21, 27 May-2 Jun 89] .....	23
Estonian Religious Leaders Meet With State Officials [O. Laev; SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 19 Apr 89] .....	23

#### CULTURE

Film Union Plenum Debates Artistic Freedom, Commercialization [G. Simanovich; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 23 May 89] .....	25
Pornography Shows in Video Salons Proliferate [S. Yurakov; SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 19 April 89] .....	30
Regulations on Video Film Production Set Back Technology [Ya. Ioskevich; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 29 Jun 89] .....	31
New Film 'Our Father' Rewritten 21 Times [L. Moskovskaya; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 29 Jun 89] ...	33
Historical Accuracy, Authenticity of Rybakov's New Novel Questioned [S. Zavorotnyy; KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 1 Jul 89] .....	34
UkSSR Writers' Union Admonished for Lack of Glasnost, Restructuring [Yu. Yachekin; RABOCHAYA GAZETA, 26 Feb 89] .....	36
Polish Culture Society Formed in Lvov [V. Basiv; RABOCHAYA GAZETA, 26 Feb 89] .....	38

#### SOCIAL ISSUES

Kazakh Trade Union Plenum Seeks To Forestall Strikes [M. Chirkov; KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA, 14 May 89] .....	39
Prison Camp Labor Said to Be Economically Beneficial [N. Vasilyeva; AGITATOR No 11, Jun 89] .....	40
U.S.-USSR Anti-Crime Association Proposed [V. Ovchinskiy; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 1 May 89] .....	40
UkSSR Criminal Code Amended [PRAVDA UKRAINY, 15 Apr 89] .....	41
UkSSR, MSSR MVD Official on Internal Troops Edict [A. Tatarinov; RADYANSKA UKRAYINA, 20 Dec 88] .....	42
Internal Affairs Official on Soviet Counternarcotics Trends, Trafficking [A. Kotlyarov; ZA RUBEZHOM No 26, 23-29 Jun 89] .....	44
New Belorussian Komsomol Department to Study Youth Problems [A. Danilov; ZNAMYA YUNOSTI, 23 Mar 89] .....	47
Future of Georgian Komsomol Outlined [MOLODEZH GRUZII, 18 May 89] .....	48
Komsomol Scientific-Research Center Director on Youth's Societal, Political Standing [I. Ilinskiy; LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 12 Jul 89] .....	49
Educators Stress Need To Ensure Schools' Economic Health [Yu. Tartanov, et al.; EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA No 51, Dec 88] .....	55
Formation of All-Union Ethnographic Service Proposed [V. Pimenov; POLITICHESKOYE OBRAZOVANIYE No 7, May 89] .....	64

REGIONAL ISSUES

Immigration Office Proposed for Estonia [A. Kollist; RAHVA HAAL, 30 Apr 89] .....	69
Birth Rate Up For Estonians; Majority Margin Still Threatened [E. Tiit; RAHVA HAAL, 2 Jun 89] .....	69
Eighth Session of Mossovet Concluded [MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA, 16 Apr 89] .....	70
Professional Soccer Club Founded [LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA, 29 Apr 89] .....	72
Siberian Culture Center Opens [A. Kostyakov; SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 17 May 89] .....	72
Railroad Workers Protect Lake [B. Plotkin; SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 18 May 89] .....	73
Massive Food Poisoning Reported in Vinnitsa Oblast [A. Gorobets; PRAVDA UKRAINY, 7 May 89] .....	73
BSSR Supreme Soviet Examines Progress in Belorussian Language Study [SELSKAYA GAZETA, 23 May 89] .....	73
Symbolism of Ukrainian National Flag Argued [Ye. Kravchenko; PRAVDA UKRAINY, 2 Jun 89] .....	74
Ukrainian Academics, Writers Participate in New York Conference [N. Maslov; PRAVDA UKRAINY, 4 Apr 89] .....	76
League of Ukrainian Americans 65th Anniversary Noted [PRAVDA UKRAINY, 29 Apr 89] .....	77
Armenian Refugees in AzSSR To Recieve Grants [BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY, 12 Jul 89] .....	77
AzSSR CC Discusses Resettlement of Armenian Refugees [BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY, 7 Jun 89] .....	77
Draft Statutes of Kazakh 'Native Language' Society [KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA, 4 Jun 89] .....	78

### Problems Confront 'New Soviet Federation'

18001275 Moscow *POLITICHESKOYE*

*OBRAZOVANIYE* in Russian No 7, May 89 pp 14-21

[Roundtable discussion reported by V. Kruzhkov: "Constitutional Problems in the Development of the Soviet Federation"]

[Text] The draft of "General Principles of Restructuring Socio-Economic Leadership in the Union Republics by Broadening Sovereign Rights, Self-Government, and Self-Financing," submitted for public discussion by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, together with the exchange of opinions which took place at a meeting of the Central Committee 21 March 1989 on a wide range of legal issues related to developing and strengthening the Soviet socialist federation, are important landmarks for the Central Committee plenum as it prepares to carry out its task of determining goals and guidelines for the second stage of reforming the political system of Soviet society.

Creating a new model of the Soviet federation takes time. It is possible, however, even today to take political and legal measures as well as organizational measures to improve relations within the federation and to strengthen the unity of the USSR while harmonizing relations between nationalities. A roundtable discussion was held to exchange opinions on these issues, attended by jurists, sociologists, historians, economists, philosophers, and demographers. Present were S. A. Abakyan, professor of Moscow State University, doctor of juridical sciences; I. O. Bisher, professor of the Latvian State University, doctor of juridical sciences; F. M. Borodkin, head of the Department of Social Problems of the Economics Institute at the Siberian Branch of the USSR Academy of Sciences, doctor of economic sciences; A. B. Vengerov, deputy department head at the Academy for the Study of the National Economy attached to the USSR Council of Ministers, doctor of juridical sciences; M. N. Guboglo, deputy director of the Institute of Ethnography of the USSR Academy of Sciences, doctor of historical sciences; L. M. Drobizheva, deputy director of the Institute of Ethnography of the USSR Academy of Sciences, doctor of historical sciences; D. L. Zlatopolskiy, professor of Moscow State University, doctor of juridical sciences; S. K. Kasakov, assistant dean of the Department of Jurisprudence at the Kirghiz State University, candidate of juridical sciences; A. I. Kovalenko, docent of the All-Union Juridical Institute of Correspondence Course Education, candidate of juridical sciences; T. Kyabin, scientific secretary of the ESSR Academy of Sciences Presidium, candidate of historical sciences; G. I. Litvinova, chief research associate of the State and Law Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, doctor of juridical sciences; I. Sh. Muksinov, group leader at the State and Law Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, candidate of juridical sciences; S. V. Polenina, chief research associate at the State and Law Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, doctor of juridical sciences; G. B. Staroboytova, senior research associate of

the Institute of Ethnography of the USSR Academy of Sciences, candidate of historical sciences; and M. A. Shafir, professor-consultant at the State and Law Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, doctor of juridical sciences.

An abridged record of the discussion of some of the more pressing problems of developing the Soviet federation follows.

### The Right of Self-Determination and Its Constitutional Sanctions

[D. L. Zlatopolskiy] The right of self-determination is one of the fundamental principles in the construction of the Soviet state, predetermining the federal character of the state. We need a deeper understanding of it today, as indeed we do about the principles of federation. These principles, unfortunately, are not reflected as they should be in the Constitution. What principles? Very briefly, the Soviet federation is established on the basis of the Soviet system and the principle of nationality, voluntary union, equal rights in one form or another, and, finally, democratic centralism. (With regard to the latter, everybody knows the extent to which it has been distorted.) Article 70 of the USSR Constitution states that the USSR is a united, federal, multinational state, formed in accordance with the principle of socialist federalism. The theoretical wealth of these principles of federation as worked out by B. I. Lenin, and their practical value in this section has been lost.

I should also like to focus attention on the term "united, federal, multinational state." It is completely unacceptable. The use of "united federal" in reference to a federated state is as much a contradiction in terms as speaking of "roasted ice." For a united state is a unitary state. We must use the terminology used in the Agreement on the Formation of the USSR, which states that the republics are unified into one federal state. Not united, but one.

[I. O. Bisher] We have even encountered the phrase "united and indivisible Union." How do you feel about this?

[D. L. Zlatopolskiy] "United and indivisible" is more appropriate in reference to tsarist Russia than the Union.

[I. O. Bisher] Our federation is founded on the principle of the self-determination of peoples. However, the substance and form of this principle has been extremely distorted. We must not close our eyes to what emerged from the federation conceived by V. I. Lenin as a union of equal republics, in which the jurisdiction and the powers of central and republic organs were subject to limitation. (Regarding Lenin's concept federalism, see the article by V. Byunitskiy appearing in Issue No. 3 of 1989.) Stalin, when he came to power, without repudiating federalism in words, reverted to his own idea of



"autonomization" and gradually transformed the union republics into entities differing little from the autonomous republics. This to no small degree facilitated the establishment of the arbitrary administrative system, which relied on rigid centralization. Unfortunately, for a very long time we justified this centralization in terms of theory, and only recently have we outgrown it, after having become convinced of the enormous harm it has done. Because of it a powerful layer of bureaucracy was built up, undermining the foundations of the state.

Now many union republics are striving to increase their sovereignty. But this is not so easy to accomplish. It must be acknowledged that the question of sovereignty itself has not been properly worked out. Often it is understood in a simplistic way and explained, especially in practice, only to a limited extent.

[M. N. Guboglo] Who in your opinion is entitled to self-determination?

[I. O. Bisher] When our republic was established, the basis of self-determination was the indigenous people [korennyaya natsiya]. Right now the situation is somewhat more complicated. Nevertheless, for historians of sovereignty the principle remains the same.

[D. L. Zlatopolskiy] I should like to qualify that in some respects. The matter of sovereignty is often tied up in our minds with the self-determination of peoples and their national territorial formations. But in fact it has three aspects. For one thing, it is state sovereignty. For another, it is national sovereignty or that of the ethnic group. And, third, it is the sovereignty of the people themselves. These are separate concepts, although they are bound up with one another.

If sovereignty is reduced to the rights of the indigenous people, then the right of self-determination for us would seem to belong only to the union republic. I do not agree with this since the right of self-determination in such a case is linked only with secession from the USSR. And that is not the case. Our right of self-determination is realized in various forms of national autonomy among the peoples of the USSR. Its highest form is the union republic. Then, in turn, the autonomous republic, the autonomous oblast, and the autonomous okrug. All these formations are also forms of national statehood and concrete manifestations of the right of the right of peoples to self-determination.

[S. A. Avakyan] I agree that the right of self-determination belongs to every national group. It is scarcely worth while, however, to link the issue of self-determination only with the establishment of some kind of national entity. Statehood is the means through which a nation, people, or ethnic group has the opportunity to express its own interests. The essence of self-determination lies in this opportunity to express these particular national

interests. Each people should be guaranteed such opportunities under the Constitution. What sort of opportunities? First, the right of self-determination up to and including the right to secede and form an independent state. Second, the opportunity to create a national state or one form or another of national autonomy within the framework of the USSR. Third, an independent decision by the people with respect to which national unit to be in. Fourth, the opportunity to change the form of one's statehood. And finally, fifth, the opportunity to abrogate one's own statehood and resolve the issue of self-identity within the framework of other political or administrative forms.

In our discussion the issue of who is entitled to self-determination has already been raised, and opinions have been expressed on the matter. It seems to me, however, that as of now the question has only been answered insofar as it refers to the Union republics. A Union republic has the right to secede from the USSR and with this is usually linked the right of self-determination. As we reform the political system, in the second stage of this process, it remains for us to resolve a host of constitutional issues related to realizing the remaining aspects of the right of self-determination. In particular, it is necessary to establish a corresponding sense of obligation on the part of higher-standing state organs to respond in a specified way to any initiative of a national group and to determine the principles of their mutual relations, so that each of the two sides possesses not only rights but obligations.

[G. V. Starovoytova] Those who have spoken before me have noted the fact that different people among us have different rights. For example, the autonomous republic or autonomous oblast does not have the right to change its republic affiliation, whereas a union republic has the right to self-determination, including secession from the USSR. This is the present state of affairs. What is the main problem with it? In my view it lies in the fact that we lack for the present a criterion for devising a system of laws. Without such a criterion we shall continue to come up against problems created in one way or another by the expressed will of the people.

[S. K. Kasakov] We cannot resolve this task so long as we have not put an end to the confusion between "sovereignty" and "self-determination." It has cropped up even in our discussion. When we are talking about sovereignty or self-determination, in my opinion it is necessary to make it clear that the right of self-determination is still not sovereignty. Sovereignty means the independent use of state power. It is vested in the major nationalities that make up the Union republics. Another thing about the right of self-determination. Each people has it, even the smallest of ethnic minorities. This manifold nature of the right of self-determination must be borne in mind, as it was by V. I. Lenin in his day when he delineated autonomous republics and other areas together with sovereign states.

[A. B. Vengerov] I agree that the right of self-determination must be protected not only for nationalities but for other ethnic groups as well. It may, for example, take the form of national cultural autonomy. To secure the totality of the rights of nations, peoples, and nationalities, we should give thought to the establishment of such an all-embracing act as "Fundamental Legislation of the USSR and Union Republics Regarding Relations Between Nationalities"—particularly in view of the fact that certain views of the long-term prospects for these relations have undergone a change. When the Union was founded and the right of self-determination of peoples, including that of secession, was first established by law, we began with the concepts of Marxist-Leninism and the utterances of Lenin that ultimately our peoples would merge. It was later that this was replaced by the idea of unity and concord of peoples.

[G. V. Starovoytova] In the present discussions the right of peoples to self-determination is most often identified with the principle of territorial integrity and its constitutional sanctions. This thesis has been heard at our roundtable discussion. But the problem is broader than that. A nation is, so to speak, the body of society, which in our case is being reborn as the lawful socialist state comes into being. The state, in accordance with the Constitution, should serve the needs of this society. And in this sense the nation's right of self-determination is in principle higher than the idea of state sovereignty, and higher than the exclusive right of territorial integrity.

[S. V. Polenina] Yes, but a nation's self-determination is most often identified with national sovereignty—the sovereignty of a Union republic. Meanwhile, in today's world a whole range of societies have been developing successfully for a long time economically, socially, and politically without fear of limitations placed on their sovereignty. As for us, we have many people in search of theoretical and practical solutions to national problems who are turning to the principles of organizing the USSR as it was in 1924, without being willing to recognize that these principles were worked out more than six decades ago, and that the global community during this period has to a considerable extent traveled by a different path.

[D. L. Zlatopolskiy] Alas, we return to the guidelines of 1924 because people departed from them. And the idea of the limited sovereignty of the union republics is still with us. It is akin to Stalin's concept of "latent sovereignty." Both presume that the sovereignty of a republic comes into being only in the event of secession from the Union. I am categorically opposed to this thesis, and I believe that a Union republic should be a sovereign state within the framework of the federation.

[T. Kyabin] In that case we should discuss who is going to decide the question of self-determination. The basic national group? Or all persons who live in the republic? And how is it to be decided? By representative bodies or through a referendum? These issues must be carefully

analyzed and sanctioned by the Constitution. In addition, when we speak of the right of self-determination, we must proceed not only on the basis of Union documents but the international pacts and declarations ratified by the Soviet Union. This aspect must also be written in by the Constitution.

[L. M. Drobizheva] Meanwhile, for the time being, the Constitution has no consistent guarantees securing the right of nations to self-determination. As a result we have a series of new expressions of national will, including some that strain relations between nationalities. Constitutional guarantees sanctioning the right of self-determination are necessary.

[I. O. Bisher] It is the Union republics that need these guarantees most of all. Right now, in Latvia, we feel that the Union republics as national states are threatened by patterns of migration. The Latvian people are becoming a national minority.

[M. N. Guboglo] But there is another aspect to this problem. Having in the Union republics a significant number of people who are not indigenous, without having mechanisms clearly specified in the Constitution for regulating relations between nationalities, we may encounter—indeed, we already are encountering—situations in which decisions are reached by the indigenous people in spite of the wishes of an ethnic minority living in that republic. I think that we have grounds to fully support Latvia and Estonia, and any other republic, when it is defending itself against the monopolistic control and arbitrary tactics of ministries and departments. But the way we do this is a two-edged sword. It can be used against the national minorities.

[L. M. Drobezheva] We have differences, and even conflicts of interest, between ethnic minorities and indigenous peoples, and we must not close our eyes to them. Meanwhile, an attempt is being made to overcome these differences by proposing one form of approach or another to reconcile their interests. However, it seems to me that the new thinking about the nationality issue is expressing itself in a diversity rather than a consolidation of approaches for realizing the rights of nationalities. This may not be properly expressed in legal terms, but here is the idea: Each person, regardless of nationality, is entitled to equal rights and equal opportunities apart from the group he represents—people, nation, whatever. Moreover, the person has equal rights apart from where, in what republic or national territorial unit, he resides. Since it is at this point that a number of problems arise, tied up with the exercise of rights by citizens of the USSR and citizens of the Union republics, and with the relations of the all-Union and republic legal and executive organs, there is no way to resolve them without analyzing the authority of the republics and the USSR.

**Delimiting the Jurisdictional Authority of the USSR and the Union Republics**

[I. O. Bisher] We are now establishing the relationship between the the Union and the Union republics. In this connection there are three extremely interesting statements by M. S. Gorbachev to which I should like to draw attention.

First, his statement that we need a strong center as well as strong republics. We in Latvia unreservedly endorse this statement. For it is only by having a strong center that we may have a strong Supreme Soviet, a strong Council of Ministers, and a strong Central Committee. However, for the present it seems, the ministries and departments are stronger than anything else. We are categorically opposed to their being strongest of all. For there are times when we find the policy of the ministries resembling certain trans-national corporations, which pump the natural wealth out of certain regions, and then abandon them, without regard for the social consequences or the other values of the local population.

Second, his remark that the republics should trust the central government—and the central government should trust the republics.

And third, concerning diversity. This issue was raised by M. S. Gorbachev in his speech before the United Nations. There must be diversity. And although this might seem to be acknowledged among us, in practice diversity is not always supported. Moreover, right now the "Fundamental Legislation of the USSR and the Union Republics," in effect, deprives republics of an opportunity to resolve a whole lot of simple questions.

[M. A. Shafir] I should like to focus on the first of the problems raised by I. O. Bisher, and I will start out with the matter of jurisdictional authority—the powers of the USSR and the union republics. From one standpoint, it is an issue of constitutional principles and legally securing them; from the other, it is a matter of existing relations.

For example, in the 1924 Constitution the subject of Union and republic jurisdictional authority was defined in very specific terms: a sphere of activities under Union jurisdiction with a list of People's Commissariats that were supposed to deal with them were inserted in "The Fundamental Law of the USSR." The exclusive nature of this list, in my view, did not promote stability, nor did it provide for proper relations between the center and the republics. An enormous number of all-Union and Union-republic ministries and departments arose, sharply increasing the jurisdictional authority of the Union. I think it is necessary to cut to a minimum the number of ministries and USSR state committees, and to insert a list of the number required into the Constitution. The distribution of jurisdictional authority will depend on the ones listed. At the same time, the fact must be

recognized that the activities of many of the ministries that are now in existence are causing a number of the problems of relations with the republics.

[A. B. Vengerov] I share the deep misgivings of people living in the republics when they fall under the arbitrary authority of the ministries and departments. But things cannot be managed by feelings alone. We need a principle of limited authority.

[A. I. Kovalenko] Yes, and in my view it is necessary to address this very principle. And for this purpose it would be appropriate to link sovereignty in the Constitution with rights and jurisdictional powers. Essentially, as you know, jurisdictional authority is one manifestation of sovereignty. By introducing this amendment, we could work out a model of this authority. To come up with an exhaustive list of rights and powers, together with a list of corresponding ministries and departments, would simply not be realistic. The Constitution cannot provide such a list except in the most general and abstract terms. However, to delimit functions, let us say, in general and as a whole, would be more correct and comprehensive.

[M. A. Shafir] The matter of delimiting Union and republic authority was first addressed in the "Agreement to Form the USSR," which was adopted on 30 December 1922. What do you think? Is this agreement still operative? Or should it be replaced by a new one? Incidentally, the USSR Constitution of 1924 included this agreement in its text, but it is not included in the constitutions of 1936 and 1977.

[I. O. Bisher] Obviously, a new Union agreement is needed. The Latvian SSR, upon entry into the Soviet Union, did not subscribe to the agreement. Decades have gone by, and much has changed. For example, a host of new industries have arisen, such as nuclear energy, electronics, and space exploration, which rightfully fall within the jurisdiction of the USSR. At the same time, new national interests have arisen that require new republic jurisdiction.

[T. Kyabin] When we speak of the real problems that arise in this area, it becomes clear that the Constitution should spell out the duties of the Union. The Union is strong only if all the Union republics are strong. We in Estonia have worked out a new variant of the Union agreement, which contains specific proposals for broadening the rights of the Union republics. A special commission has also been established to make proposals for extending rights both with respect to state government and in the area of financing.

[D. L. Zlatopolskiy] In my judgment there is no need to adopt a new Union agreement. Or, at least, I have not heard any cogent arguments in favor of it. The issue cannot simply be raised whether we should alter the agreed-upon principles of our Union without sufficient reason. It so happened that the "Agreement to Form the USSR" was signed by the four founding

republics. Bearing in mind that one of them comprised three as they are today, we are speaking of six charter republics. That leaves nine republics that did not sign the agreement. They could, of course, go back and do so. That is all very well. But when these republics joined the USSR, they were familiar with the Union Constitution, before it underwent any changes. After considering the question of joining the Union, in doing so, they approved the Union agreement.

[L. M. Drobizheva] Personally, I am inclined to the view that it is better to conclude a new agreement since life moves forward as new problems and ideas appear. In the agreement it is possible to set standards delimiting jurisdictional authority.

[T. Kyabin] Here, a serious problem crops up since it is not possible to speak of extending the rights of central and republic organs simultaneously. Broadening at once the rights of the Union and the republics cannot be done. If the rights of the Union are broadened, the rights of the republics contract, and vice versa.

[A. I. Kovalenko] Why do you deny the possibility of extending the rights of the USSR and the Union republics simultaneously? If rights are extended in different directions and in different areas, this becomes possible. All depends on the matter under jurisdiction. The USSR, for example, may extend its authority with respect to the management of a single national economic complex, while the republics extend theirs in the field of ecology. Why is this impossible?

[I. O. Bisher] But if the Union republics acquire additional rights in the field of ecology, for example, Union rights diminish in the field of power engineering.

[I. Sh. Muksinov] I think the time has come to halt the uninterrupted build-up of authority by Union bodies. Commencing in 1932 when the All-Russian Soviet of the National Economy was eliminated and the power of the People's Commissariats was increased, the jurisdictional authority of the Union has steadily increased. Because of this the rights of the Union republics have been poorly implemented, as have the provisions contained in Article 77 of the Constitution with regard to their participation in resolving issues of the Union. Since 1944 the conditions have not existed for republic relations with foreign states or their participation in matters of foreign trade. A democratic system of procedures for resolving disagreements between Union and republic bodies does not exist.

There was, it is true, a period between 1957 and 1965, after the 20th Party Congress, when local authority was strengthened. But everything was overturned following the October 1964 plenum. The September 1965 plenum eliminated the republic rights gained. It seems to me that under the banner of strengthening principles of union, they were actually putting these matters under their own supervision. The issue of dividing jurisdiction between

the Union and the republics therefore should be decided by the same principles as in the case of the enterprises. "All may be done that is not forbidden." The republics may do anything that has not been turned over to the Union.

[M. A. Shafir] I think we must discuss the problem raised by I. O. Bisher concerning the relations between the Union and the republics in terms of legislation. In my view we have actually too many principles. Do we need so many fundamental principles of legislation? Their number should be restricted by indicating which of them are exclusively within the jurisdiction of the USSR. I think that these may be the principles of criminal law, the use of land, of water, and so on, as listed previously. Everything else must be placed under the Union republics, and every effort should be made to broaden the scope of their lawful activities.

[S. V. Polenina] I should also like to focus on this question and, more broadly, on the regulatory authority of the USSR and the Union republics. What should be the relationship between the Union and the Union republics with respect to the regulation of standards? Personally, it still seems to me that, on the whole, the Fundamental Legislation and codes of regulations have justified themselves and in normal use yield excellent results.

This is with regard to legislative standards. But how about the normative documentation pertaining to executive and economic organs? Generally, when we speak of the lawful state, we mean increasing role of law, subordinating all other acts to it. At the same time it must not be forgotten that not only the laws of the USSR must be strengthened but the laws of the Union republics as well.

The USSR Council of Ministers in its regulatory affairs does not even take the trouble to familiarize itself with the laws of the Union republics, and the departments are even worse in this respect. In my opinion there is only one way out of this situation. Article 74 of the USSR Constitution, which specifies the priority of Union law over that of the Union republics (absolutely correctly from my point of view), should, I believe, be amplified with a second section, the substance of which would be: "In the event of a discrepancy between a decree of the USSR Council of Ministers or an enforceable enactment by an all-Union ministry, state committee, or department with a law of a Union republic with respect to a matter under the joint authority of the USSR and Union republics, the law of the republic shall remain in force."

[D. L. Zlatopolskiy] I should like to comment on the so-called joint jurisdictional authority, mentioned by S. V. Polenina as being shared by the Union and the republics. I say "so-called" because to my mind there is at present no such joint authority. Let me attempt to demonstrate this. Jurisdiction is an area of governmental activity in which rights and duties are exercised. This may be a commonly shared area. But rights and duties

are not held in common. The fact that Union bodies play the dominant role here proves that there is no joint authority. And since this is the case, in order to set limits on Union and republic functions in a given area, guarantees of the constitutional status of the Union republics must be clearly defined.

### Problems and Proposals

[I. O. Bisher] I think that the problem of protecting the interests of the Union republics cannot be limited merely to the mechanism for secession, which no one wants to make use of. (It is clear, moreover, that it is ill suited for use and that there ought to be another mechanism for this purpose.) I suggest that the republics ought to be protected against decisions by Union organs that affect their vital interests. The republics should have some sort of a mechanism that would enable them to maintain their own sense of self-identity. In the event that the status of a Union republic and its vital interests should be affected by a law or constitutional principle, it should have a right of veto or some other means of protecting itself.

I do not think that this protection should be extended to cover all aspects of Union law. There are some issues that must be resolved jointly. But if Union law affects the vital interests of the Union republics or their status, then specific steps must be taken to protect the rights of the minority.

[A. B. Vengerov] I agree that the possibility of secession is a very grave matter. I think that the right of secession in the Constitution needs to be preserved. But, of course, the secession of a national group from the Union cannot be a simple procedure. From my point of view it is the most difficult of political and judicial problems, and in order to resolve it consideration must be given not only to a people's interest in self-determination but with due regard for the interests of the entire federation and the national economy as a whole.

[D. L. Zlatopolskiy] Personally, I am against the right of veto. If we should allow it, it would become impossible for our federation to develop normally.

[S. V. Polenina] With respect to the particular features of the republics, we are still forgetting for the moment the numbers of people who live in them. Of course, it is necessary to keep in mind the principle of equality of the Union republics. That is very important. But we must also keep in mind the numerical population for a simple reason. Russia, for example, is a big conglomerate of autonomous republics, autonomous okrugs, and so on, which possess the capacity for self-expression through it. It is simply impossible to accept such a situation as tolerable when any little Union republic, smaller than Yakutia and Bashkiria in terms of territory as well as population, let us suppose, has the right to make a decision paralyzing the life of the country.

[L. M. Drobizheva] Here, a problem arises that is not simply one of relations between the center and the republics but of relations between the republics themselves. I therefore think it essential to make provisions in the all-Union statutes to regulate inter-republic relations in addition to center-republic relations.

[S. V. Polenina] It appears to me that among the provisions that must be made over without fail is Article 78 of the USSR Constitution where it speaks of changing boundaries between the Union republics. We cannot live under conditions in which, if a single republic objects to such a change, there is no other recourse provided. Apparently, some kind of supplementary multi-step procedure for concurrence must be worked out, involving the other union republics.

[A. B. Vengerov] In my view, such an inadequately utilized constitutional safeguard for republic rights as turning disputes over to an arbitration board might be helpful. Arbitration, for example, could prove useful in disputes between Union and republic organs. Referring disputes for review by a trusted arbitration board is a needed resource.

[S. V. Polenina] I want to endorse the idea of arbitration. Concerning territorial disputes, for example, and the use of Article 78, in a great number of cases arbitration, even consisting, let us suppose, of two or three other republics, is entirely plausible, and there is no inconsistency in having a special body for constitutional oversight.

[G. I. Litvinova] It would also be a good idea to give some thought to the equality of rights of the republics. I suppose that the RSFSR is today the only republic whose governmental and legal situation (in terms of the ability to exercise its constitutional rights) is extremely limited by comparison with any other republic. Is not that one of the causal factors in the demographic decline—in the rise of the death rate over the birth rate—which has afflicted a number of its territories?

I suppose that the first matter that we should consider is establishing equal rights and equal opportunities in terms of development for each republic and each nationality. Russia is also a republic. The fact that it has no republic Communist Party or Central Committee, no Academy of Sciences, and no republic affiliates of public organizations in a number of cases is, I think, a grievous fact that does not speak well for it. I am told, "These matters are decided by the Union organs." If someone should prove to me that 14 communist parties and 14 academies of sciences have not played any positive role in the social and economic development of peoples elsewhere, then I would agree and say that Russia does not need such support. But let us be realistic. The power that is exerted in our republic is not so much that of the Soviet Union as it is of the Communist Party. If any other republic lacked its own party and Central Committee, I would not be sure that it could keep pace with the

others in its development. This is one of the reasons why the RSFSR lags behind other republics in terms of social and economic development.

Here are some specific proposals. First, let us concern ourselves with the creation of equal conditions, rights, and genuine opportunities in the republics. Second, let us try to provide opportunities for regional development commensurate with their economic potential and population density. Equal importance in terms of economic significance, potential, and population density means achieving parity in terms of organs of jurisdictional authority to direct the development of these regions.

[I. Sh. Muksinov] I believe that right now one of the most vulnerable areas is to be found in the autonomous republics. The very fact they are not objects of federation puts them in an extremely difficult position by comparison with any of the republics. As early as 1948, permanent representation by the autonomous republics, with the exception of the Yakut ASSR, was arbitrarily eliminated at the center. This process of elimination is, of course, tantamount to acknowledging that these peoples are of no special interest. Subsequently, the autonomous republics were prohibited from making appeals directly to Union organs, bypassing the RSFSR Council of Ministers. The system has not been abolished, which means that it is still in effect. It must be abolished immediately.

Finally, a decision must be made regarding whether we are to consider the autonomous republics states or simply krais and oblasts. We must somehow extricate ourselves from this predicament. There is a movement within the autonomous republics to transform them into Union republics. We must come to understand why it is they want this.

[M. N. Guboglo] It is not proper for us to judge movements in support of altering governmental structure or constitutional sanctions for self-determination unilaterally. Such a movement could turn into a "dictatorship of the majority," imposed by a national referendum.

[G. I. Litvinova] I think this issue should be put in a more general way: We must begin at the bottom rather than the top, and we must emphasize the extension of rights of localities, rather than republics. Let there be no miscalculation by any republic in extending local rights.

[F. M. Borodkin] I agree with that statement. It seems to me, too, that it is not possible to make any sense of the relations between the Union and republics if we do not focus at a lower level. Of course, the ability of any republic or any territorial formation to govern is derived from the competence of those administrative bodies that operate in its territory. Obviously, we need constitutional provisions to compel every governmental body in the territorial units to build support from the bottom instead of imposing decisions from above.

For example, the Association of Cities established in Siberia is just such a grassroots movement. The cities themselves with their administrative organs proposed its establishment, and they collected the funds to maintain staff support for coordination and administration.

[S. V. Polenina] Do you think Siberia should have self-determination?

[F. M. Borodkin] A document entitled "The Situation With Respect to Urban Economic Self-sufficiency," prepared for the most recent seminar of the Association of Siberian Cities held in Tyumen 17-19 November 1988, offers two options. The first is based on existing regulations, and it contains nothing unusual. The second, a more radical document, surveys urban resources that will not be tapped for quite a number of years. It offers a very long-range perspective, and it speaks specifically of economic sovereignty for each territory that is capable of self-government and can be identified as an economic community.

[L. M. Drobizheva] If we are going to discuss self-determination in terms, let us say, of a group of cities, then within the republic there must be several communities of this kind. In other words, we are calling for community self-sufficiency as opposed to republic self-sufficiency?

[F. M. Borodkin] No, not opposed. Only the republic, in its entirety, has the prerequisites for economic self-sufficiency—ethnic and historical as well as economic. But any administrative entity, it seems to me, may have the right of self-determination.

[D. L. Zlatopolskiy] Our discussion has dealt with different forms of governmental and administrative organizations, possessing different rights. Union and autonomous republics are national states; the rest are nation-states or territorial formations. National states [natsionalnyye gosudarstva] have their own constitutions; nation-states [natsionalno-gosudarstvennyye] do not. Both types, however, are in need of new laws. As was pointed out in the course of our discussion, legislation drawn up recently, in the early 1980's, does meet the needs of the changes that have taken place. Hence the specific proposal for the passage of new laws wherein it will be possible to establish both the rights of the union republics and the national minorities in them together with the mechanism for insuring their local autonomy.

In the second stage of development, it remains for us to find practical solutions for many of these problems. In order to do this it is necessary to study, generalize, and correctly evaluate all relevant recent experience, both positive and negative.

\*\*\*

Perestroyka has revealed quite a few painful problems in the field of international relations. Obviously, they are not going to be solved immediately in one stroke. Here,

as nowhere else, it is necessary to use special tact, care, and a gradual approach in thinking through the various options. At the same time, we cannot put off "until later" working out a conceptual scheme for the further development of the Soviet federation, particularly in view of the fact that the general direction of this process has already been determined—that is, a transition from rigidly centralized federalism to a new form of federal structure based on combining a strong center with strong Union republics.

The roundtable discussion, of course, only touched on the most important issues of national and state construction in improving the Soviet federation. The development of international relations will pose new tasks and problems. To respond to these tasks simultaneously, making sound decisions, while taking into consideration the entire multiplicity of interests, is perhaps the lesson to be drawn from the existing situation and applied to the future as well as the principal conclusion of today's discussion.

Approaches to the solution of a range of important practical problems have already been presented. The CPSU Central Committee conference of 21 March 1989, in particular, discussed such subjects as setting limits on the authority of the USSR and the Union republics; broadening the rights of the Union republics; strengthening the legal status of the autonomous republics, oblasts, and okrugs; free development and equal utilization of the languages of peoples in the USSR, and also of the Russian language as the language of international discourse; and improving legislation regarding citizenship. Changes for the better in these and other areas of international relations will help to strengthen international unity and the friendship of peoples of our country.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Politicheskoye obrazovaniye". 1989

**New Ministers Appointed in RSFSR**  
18001456 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA  
in Russian 27 Jul 89 Second Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "In the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet"]

[Text] The Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet has appointed:

Comrade Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Khomyakov as Deputy Chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, and as Chairman of the RSFSR State Planning Committee; Comrade Viktor Nikitovich Zabelin as Minister of Construction for the Urals and Western Siberia; comrade Vladimir Ivanovich Reshetilov as Minister of Construction for the northern and western regions of the RSFSR; and Comrade Arkadiy Nikolayevich Shchepetilnikov as Minister of Construction for the southern regions of the RSFSR.

Comrade Nikolay Ivanovich Maslennikov has been relieved of his duties as Deputy Chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers and as Chairman of the RSFSR State Planning Committee in connection with his retirement.

Comrade Vyacheslav Mikhaylovich Lebedev was selected as Chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Court.

**CPSU's Far East Election Defeats Viewed**  
18001086 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA  
INDUSTRIYA in Russian 21 May 89 p 1

[Article by Yu. Strugov, deputy director of Khabarovsk-promproyekt [Khabarovsk Industrial Project] and member of the CPSU gorkom [municipal committee]: "Trust Returns"]

[Text] Too little time remains until the Congress of Peoples Deputies and we have still not intelligently interpreted the election results. We are still experiencing the euphoria of their unprecedented democratic nature. Yes, we could not have dreamt of this a year or so ago. However, we will not delude ourselves.

Why did party and soviet workers suffer defeat in many districts, particularly in the Far East? Their programs really were not any worse than their competitors' programs. The holders of power experienced an unforeseen seizure [of power]. The voters even preferred less attractive programs and previously little known people. Can we consider such a vote to be responsible? I do not think so. You could not reproach a voter for anything because his vote would turn out to be, I repeat, forced.

Our voter has, for the time being, obtained one part of the voting right—the right to be "against" someone or something. The line has still not reached the realized right to the "for" [someone or something].

Judge for yourselves. Self-promoted workers—independents, representatives from workers collectives not sanctioned from above—ended up in a curious position. And it was precisely because the situation urged on and literally provoked them to demagoguery and to superficial promises. And of course why not? So what if the "independent" does not fulfill his propaganda promises?

A candidate's worth is not high if there is no guarantee of his pre-election promises or if a force does not stand behind him which will also even support him in defeat. Plainly speaking, the vote does not primarily need people but the programs and social forces which stand behind them. That is, all the forces of society without



exception, including both those standing on the party platform and the alternative [candidates] must have the opportunity to show their worth.

This will also be a real and not only a proclaimed opportunity to elect authorities and, moreover, to legally and bloodlessly change them. This is precisely the condition, in my opinion, which primarily determines a legitimate state. The requirement for it did not arise by accident. It would seem that we have enough laws which are good and varied. But there is insufficient belief in them.

Take the situation with cooperatives, for example. What is restraining development of this movement? There are many factors on the surface: Both imperfections in the mechanism of state cooperation with cooperatives, ill will in a number of places in public opinion, a shortage of enterprising people, and a legion of bureaucrats who prohibit everything... The basic cause of distrust is that a cooperative—is in earnest and for a long time. Therefore, a solid man, educated by the experience of stagnation, will not get involved in this business.

Life demands support of progressive trends primarily by political methods. And what is sometimes resulting?

The politicians, not the cooperatives, are to blame because the cooperatives have shown their unattractive side. Politicians, and not the farmers, are really to blame for the persistent shortage of each and every thing. They are, and not the illiterate or mercenary land reclamation specialists, in the final analysis, guilty of defiling our land.

This is why the holders of power experienced defeat during the elections. But this means one thing—we are forfeiting our trust in it. And here, pardon me, euphoria is inappropriate. And the more gloating over the defeat of some official or other, the more so.

Having voted for some and elected others, in some places, they are being removed from power unjustly and the disrespected and weak are coming to power. Today we really need and it is a vital necessity for the authorities to be strong.

We do not have a right to make mistakes for we simply do not have enough vitality to correct them. We need, not discord, but a union of society's healthy forces. For this, we need to present to the people, not utopian goals, but regulated and real goals which meet the primary needs and interests of man, not wavering and not throwing from one extreme to the other and not losing the virtue to conduct political and economic reforms. Only strong authority is capable of doing this. Only it can break the resistance of bureaucrats. Only respected, self-assured authority can serve as a guarantee of democracy and glasnost because truth is not frightening to the strong and wise.

The new Soviet parliament must also become precisely this, a strong and wise ruling organ. To return trust in authority is one of its main tasks. It is true that a difficult legacy has become its lot. The load of distrust is being transferred to it which has accumulated in society over many years. Yes and it has not had time to forgive or shake loose. The people are expecting quickly perceptible changes not only on the pages of the central newspapers but in their lives, too. The bureaucracy, sometimes alarmed, is hoping that poorly organized peoples deputies who are burdened with their pre-election promissory notes, will rush to repay them and will become entangled in personal and local issues and leave the whole totality of real power to it, the bureaucracy.

Meanwhile, real power belongs to the people represented by the peoples deputies in accordance with the law and the Constitution. Workers and peasants, engineers and directors, scholars and writers are today becoming real politicians and not political puppets. A difficult mission has befallen them. It is new and unaccustomed. But a cat may look at a king.

#### **Kazakh CP First Secretary Kolbin on Restructuring**

18300643 *Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA*  
in Russian 19 May 89 pp 2-3

[Speech by the G.V. Kolbin, first secretary of the Kazakhstan CP Central Committee: "On the Tasks of the Republic Party Organization to Deepen the Processes of Perestroika in Light of the April (1989) CPSU Central Committee Plenum]

[Text] Comrades! The results of the April (1989) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee for our party are of fundamental significance and, I might even say, to a certain degree turning-point importance. In essence, they go far beyond the confines of the reviewed organizational questions in the activities of the CPSU Central Committee and include a significantly broader spectrum of problems concerning perestroika which has begun in our country.

I feel that I would not be in error if I said that the attention of the Plenum participants was basically focused on two key aspects. In the first place, never before in such an acute and uncompromising manner has the question been posed of the urgent need to raise in every possible way the responsibility of each member of the CPSU Central Committee, each candidate member of the Central Committee and member of the Central Auditing Commission of the CPSU for the course of the perestroika processes in all spheres of life. Secondly, the discussion held at the Plenum became a serious attempt at a profound political analysis of the enormous 4-year work by the party to practically implement the ideas proposed in April 1985. Ideas which marked a major turning point to new thinking, to a renewal of Soviet society and to the renewal of socialism.



The implementing of the truly strategic course elaborated by the 27th Party Congress has required a stubborn search for clear, constructive approaches to achieving the set goals. This has been a supercomplex task since it has been a matter of colossal work aimed at renewing the moral and psychological guidelines of the broad masses and moving from the former administrative-pressure methods of the stagnation period to democratic methods aimed at the greatest possible development of initiative, labor and political activeness of the workers and at increasing their involvement in the high end results.

Today it can be said with full justification that the previous 4 years have not been wasted. It has been possible to find fundamental solutions and the entire range of these solutions has become a firm political, economic and legal basis for perestroyka. In this crucial time, the CPSU Central Committee has shown the greatest solidarity and a profound understanding of its responsibility for the fate of the nation and the entire world. Its consistent and balanced actions have made it possible to overcome a number of complex domestic and foreign policy problems as well as halt dangerous crisis phenomena which determined the difficult atmosphere in which the nation had been living over recent decades.

Our party's Central Committee has demonstrated the best Leninist traditions. Along with decisiveness and courage in complex, extraordinary situations it has also brilliantly demonstrated its enormous intellectual potential and has convincingly proven that the party, having become the initiator and organizer of perestroyka, is capable in the future of remaining its leader and successfully guiding Soviet society along the path of the profound revolutionary changes.

Of course, it has required a great deal of effort for the CPSU Central Committee like the entire party to be on top of today's tasks. Many had to reform themselves and change the usual style of leadership. The processes of democratization and glasnost, having developed widely in society and involving primarily internal party life, have forced the communists to be actively concerned with self-education, self-improvement and studying political work methods. A major replacement and strengthening of the cadre corps were essential.

This can also be seen from the example of the Kazakhstan CP Central Committee. Its Buro, over the period since the 27th CPSU Congress, has been almost completely replaced and for various reasons 16 persons have been removed from Central Committee membership. Some 65 secretaries of the party obkoms have been replaced along with 630 secretaries of the gorkoms and raykoms. Major changes in the cadres of soviet and economic bodies have also occurred.

In practical terms during the years of perestroyka, two stages of cadre reorganization have been carried out in the republic. The first had the nature of a purging of the party, soviet and economic bodies of persons who had

discredited themselves by major infractions of the standards of social life, all sorts of careerists, opportunists and toadies, corrupt elements and so forth. The second stage which even now cannot be considered over was brought about by new tasks which have objectively arisen in the course of carrying out perestroyka.

Even in the first years of Soviet power, V.I. Lenin had written that under conditions "...where the task of persuading a majority of the people or winning power and suppressing the resistance of exploiters came to the forefront, it is completely natural that among the leaders predominantly agitators have moved to the forefront.... Conversely, those tasks...which consist of accounting and supervision of production and the distribution of products bring practical leaders and organizers to the forefront. In accord with this there should be a certain reevaluation of the leaders, a certain moving about of them, since it is impossible for them independently to adapt to the new conditions and to the new task."

The situation described by the party leader is surprisingly similar to the one we are experiencing today. In actuality, there is no need to convince someone of the need for revolutionary changes or agitate for perestroyka. Virtually all strata of Soviet society are profoundly aware of its necessity. And now, when the people have come to trust the party and fully support its course, a new task has moved to the forefront, that is, how to manage perestroyka. It is a question of management when, in using the words of V.I. Lenin, "of predominant significance is not policy but rather economics" and "political tasks hold a subordinate place in relation to economic tasks."

Understandably for this we need qualitatively new leadership cadres who meet the spirit of the times and are capable of finding new approaches to resolving the difficult problems and bring about truly revolutionary changes in the assigned area of work; who possess a higher degree of responsibility for the assigned job. Precisely a profound awareness of this necessity has determined the truly party-like and highly moral action by a group of members and candidate members of the CPSU Central Committee and members of the CPSU Central Auditing Commission who forwarded their appeal to the Central Committee and Central Auditing Commission.

This document, in particular, states: "...We, being elected to the leading bodies of our party at the 27th CPSU Congress, during the period after the congress have been retired on pension because of age or state of health.

"We feel that at present, when all comrades who are members of the CPSU Central Committee and the CPSU Central Auditing Commission must work hard to participate in perestroyka, in the interests of the question

we must remove ourselves from membership and candidate membership in the CPSU Central Committee and membership in the Central Auditing Commission."

This appeal was published in the press and all those present here undoubtedly are familiar with it. I feel that each of us has a feeling of gratitude to the party veterans who showed not only civil courage but also a profound understanding of the current moment and loyalty to Lenin's ideas. In frank conversations which I and other members of the CPSU Central Committee had with those who signed the given appeal one repeatedly heard from the signers frequent statements in a true party spirit that they themselves felt awkward as objectively they were unable to take an active part in party and state activities.

The CPSU Central Committee Plenum was understanding of this request dictated by party consciousness and by a true concern for the fate of perestroika and considered it possible to grant it. The Central Committee membership was somewhat filled out by candidate members of the CPSU Central Committee, however the total number of members of the Central Committee and the Central Auditing Commission has been reduced. In line with this, the work loads on the remaining comrades have significantly risen and this reaffirms the necessity of increasing the responsibility of each of them for the state of affairs in the assigned area of perestroika and for organizing and involving an ever-greater number of persons to take an active part in the perestroika processes.

The entire question is that we, the communists, carefully weigh and correctly assess the approaches of the April (1989) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee to the strengthening of our membership. They must understand that it is a question not of purging the party or that someone might regret a prestigious and honorary place for a hard-working and ready-to-retire person. The necessity has arisen of raising the role of the Central Committee in the diverse and hard work of renewing our society. This can be achieved only with a maximum return from each party member who is a member of the Central Committee with his highest personal activeness.

Here in far from last place are the physical capabilities of a person, his ability during the current, let us be frank, difficult times to totally dedicate himself to his job. It is no secret that a 12-14-hour workday without holidays and days off has become the lot of party workers everywhere. And the reason is certainly not that they are unable to correctly organize their working time. The reason is the enormous enthusiasm which has formed literally in all spheres of social life and the depth of this is just now beginning to be truly felt. Naturally, such effort is not within the reach of everyone.

Here is what I would particularly like to emphasize. Physical forces are not eternal. It is quite natural that they diminish over the years. Spiritual forces are not

subordinate to the times. Precisely they have made it possible for our party comrades to disregard personal ambitions and personal interests and take a difficult but correct decision.

Possibly for precisely this reason the Central Committee Plenum started in not the completely usual manner with a somewhat somber but at the same time optimistic note in a completely frank discussion with the comrades who generously shared their ideas on the future activities of the Central Committee and wished it fruitful work for the good of the party, for the Soviet people and for perestroika. For this reason the atmosphere at the Plenum assumed a cast of particular confidentiality and sincerity. And when M.S. Gorbachev proposed that all the speeches be published, this was received with approval.

From the press, everyone knows what the discussion was about. Along with the firm conviction of the need to further develop the perestroika processes, virtually each of the speakers frankly stated what was on his mind. And this was done not off a piece of paper, not from a previously prepared text, but from the soul, without being concerned for the correctness of each sentence and not fearing harsh words. The questions in the social area were raised with particular urgency as the slow solution to these has evoked legitimate dissatisfaction among the people. These include the insufficiently high increase rates for food and consumer goods and housing construction. Serious concern was voiced in the speeches of those who spoke of the difficult problems of interethnic relations and the noticeable decline in discipline and law and order.

Certainly many drew attention to the fact that in unanimously choosing the most pertinent and urgent questions for their speeches, the Plenum participants were not unanimous in their assessment let alone in the approaches to solving the problems. Some correctly assumed that maximum use must be made of the freedom of action provided by perestroika for achieving the desired end results while others focused attention on shortcomings in the work of the central bodies. Some even said that supposedly the party's authority had recently declined and this was caused by the fact that perestroika had not justified the hopes placed on it.

After such comments, the people had a legitimate question: How can you, a party organization leader from just a single region, indiscriminately judge the party as a whole? Would it not be better to say frankly, without cunning, that under your insufficiently skilled leadership the party organization has lost its positions and authority since the results of perestroika in the region are so meager that people simply do not notice them? This would be perhaps not new but at least honest. Oh, no. Because it is much more convenient to represent one's own errors and failings as a general party phenomenon, to lay the blame on the shoulders of others and at the

same time appear on the rostrum as an original and bold, not fearing to "disclose" the existing mistakes in the activities of the superior bodies.

M.S. Gorbachev spoke very precisely about how one should judge such people. "We must learn to identify, to bring out into the open, to neutralize the maneuvers of the opponents of perestroika, that is, those who impede things, who throw a wrench in the works, who gloat over difficulties and setbacks and try to take us back to the past." In this work we must rely on the broad masses who believe the party and correctly see in it the sole organizing force capable of consolidating society on the platform of perestroika.

Of course, no one is guaranteed against errors. And we cannot help but agree that the reasons for the low results in certain areas of perestroika at times are precisely in the insufficiently effective work of the central bodies. With good reason, self-critical words were heard from the Plenum's rostrum that the workers are dissatisfied with the solving of urgent problems "in a specific city, rayon, oblast and republic, in one or another sector and in the nation as a whole."

Here, as they say, there is nothing to add and nothing to take away as the judgment is accurate and causing serious reflection on improving the activities of both the CPSU Central Committee, the Politburo and the Union government. Certainly it is generally recognized that the person who has been given a great deal is also held responsible. But, in speaking about the high responsibility of the center which we must not in any event play down, we must not forget our own responsibility in order not be like that ill-starred critic who in the eyes of someone else sees the mote but in his own does not note the dullard.

The main value of the discussion which occurred at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum was precisely that running as a constant theme through the comments of a majority of the speakers was the need for the greatest possible rise in the role of the local—oblast and republic—party bodies in carrying out the urgent problems. Our current meeting of the party aktiv is devoted to this same goal, that is, to discussing the tasks of the republic party organization considering the demands of the April (1989) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee.

Comrades! One of the key questions which evoked debate at the Plenum was the question of the further development and establishment of the economic reform. And this is no accident, as the most acute problems of social life and our assessments of the effectiveness of perestroika are linked precisely to it. According to the logic of the changes being carried out in the nation, people have the right to expect a corresponding return. However, 4 years later they still encounter a shortage of food and a number of daily essentials, a lack of housing,

interruptions in the delivery of raw materials and preassembled articles in production and which disrupt the normal working rhythm. All of this has a negative effect upon the mood of the workers and in no way helps to reduce social tension.

Even now, some in our republic are beginning to show defeatist attitudes, and notes of disappointment and mistrust in perestroika are beginning to creep in. Supposedly no changes have come about and as before life is not as good as in the developed countries and so forth.

In actuality, we are still far from the desired standard of living. But it would be naive to assume that the economy, seriously afflicted by the numerous illnesses of the stagnation period could "recuperate" so quickly and recover from all its ailments. But one cannot help but see the positive processes going on at present in the economic sphere and which, regardless of the contradictory and at times very complex nature of perestroika, are steadily making headway. Cost accounting is steadily changing the psychology of people and their attitude toward things and is shaping a completely new type of worker who is capable of fully realizing the broadest opportunities of socialism.

In order to be convinced of this, one has merely to look back to the recent past and soberly assess what was and what has happened. For example, take food supply. It undoubtedly has improved and people notice this.

Where have the foodstuffs come from? How have we been able in just 3 years to add almost 10 kg of meat to per capita consumption, while during the period from 1975 through 1985, this increase in the republic was just 2 kg? The unquestionable answer is that perestroika has helped achieve such a tangible change. Precisely it has made it possible to emancipate the economic initiative of the people and to get rid of the numerous prohibitions which ran contrary to common sense and which for many years fettered and literally nullified the natural entrepreneurship of the tillers of the field.

Leaders and specialists have set out to resolve such specific questions as the feed supply, the improving of the farms and the reproduction of the herd. There has been an integration of socialized production and family farms not in words but in deed. We have ceased counting how many heads of cattle a peasant keeps on his private plot and the more the better! We have stopped depriving others of feed and if you need land for producing feed, then help yourself. If you wish lease both the land and the livestock or organize a private farm. Only work, feed yourself and others!

At present, outside the republic they know about the good food supply in Tselinograd, Kokchetav, Taldykurgan, Semipalatinsk and certain other oblasts of Kazakhstan. The central newspapers write about them and they speak about them in all corners of the nation. Delegations from the neighboring oblasts, including

from the RSFSR, travel here. They come in order to see a living, visible example of what perestroyka can provide if the opportunities granted by it are skillfully employed.

The secret of success is essentially simple. It consists in a thrifty eye, in the entrepreneurship of the leaders who finally have freedom of action and freedom to do for the good of others everything that is not prohibited by the law. And hence, the abruptly changing approaches to solving the food problem. While previously for many leaders it was more important to "thunder" with a victorious report about the fulfillment of the plan, at present the sole criterion for successful work is the presence of a broad assortment of food products on the store shelves.

In truth, it cannot be said that an understanding of this truth came about easily or painlessly. When in 1987 the Kazakhstan CP Central Committee began to place rigid demands on the number of types of meat products coming up for sale, many began to smirk: this is the point we have reached, they have begun to make demands on assortment when there is not enough ordinary meat. If there is a piece of meat on the counter, people don't need any more....

With good reason it is said that at times simplicity is worse than theft. Such an oversimplified approach to the problem precisely shows the complete miscomprehension on the part of individual leaders as to how and from what side a start toward solution should be made. Certainly under present-day conditions in order to offer continuous supplies of meat products it is essential to know not only what assortment there should be but also at what price—state or cooperative—is to be employed and what remains on the counter and what not. In a word, Lenin's admonishment "learn to trade" has assumed particular pertinence now. And the person who still understands little in the organization of trade and continues to feel that the struggle for a broad assortment of meat, dairy, groat and other products is a mere whim of the leadership is a hopelessly out-of-touch leader completely incapable of managing the perestroyka processes.

Conversely, where they have boldly begun to institute new approaches and have shown initiative and tenacity here, at present there are several-score types of meat products for sale! And there they handle not frozen but rather fresh meat and there are also sufficient convenience foods. And all of this because they have actively set out to develop a processing industry and completely process the meat and other agricultural products.

For example, take the Alma-Ata Slaughterhouse, where from 1 ton of livestock they product 2,161 rubles worth of products. And similar enterprises in Chimkent and Uralsk produce exactly half the amount. Here we can judge who is running things and how. In one instance it is thrifty, efficient, with a desire to sell not only a piece

of meat to the purchaser but also to maximally satisfy his demands. In the other, it is merely to escape from the needs of the people and take shelter behind the notorious "gross" indicator.

Certainly with such an unsuitable attitude toward things it is hard to achieve an abundance of food products for any choice and taste. It is hard to hope that our stores in the near future will become similar to those which we describe to one another in returning from trips to Western countries. To us it seems a tall tale that in certain U.S. stores there are up to 70-100 types of cheese alone. We cannot even buy a simple soft cheese, let alone any other types.

We must not close our eyes to the fact that Kazakhstan for many years has lagged significantly behind in food supply for the public in terms of a number of important items and areas. In many regions, there is an acute shortage of vegetables, fruits, groats, dairy and meat products. Often there is not even the most essential for human life. We cannot tolerate such a situation any more. In profoundly recognizing the entire acuteness of the problem, the Kazakhstan CP Central Committee and the republic government have raised the task of increasing per capita meat production by another 5 kg during the current and next years in order to bring the overall increase during the current five-year plan to at least 15 kg. A substantial rise in the production of other types of food is also planned.

These goals are feasible under the conditions of an active struggle for saving agricultural products and reducing their losses, introducing lease relationships, individual farms and other progressive forms for managing agriculture.

At present, in the republic almost one-third of the kolkhozes and sovkhoses is introducing the internal farm form of leasing and on a majority of them there has been a noticeable decline in production costs and profit has risen. For example, take the Yermetauskiy ray-spetskhodzobyedineniye [Rayon Special Farm Association] in Tselinograd Oblast. In 1988, gross product output here in comparison with the previous year increased by 20 percent, around 6 million rubles of profit were earned and the profitability level reached 60 percent. And at present there are already scores of such collectives where the new economic relations have provided a high effect.

In Kazakhstan there currently are 49 individual farms. This, of course, is few but it is a start, as they say, and experience is being gained. For example, Yu. Bekkayev from the Chemolganskiy Sovkhoz in Alma-Ata Oblast has leased 10 hectares of pastureland and 100 hectares of hayfields and using a Gosbank credit has purchased 10 calves and with his entire family is working on his own farm.

A different path has been followed by the Raskanov family at Karatalskiy Sovkhoz in East Kazakhstan Oblast. With a loan received from the farm, they have purchased 50 cows, 30 head of young animals and purchased a MTZ-50 tractor. The sovkhoz has leased to it 30 hectares of pastureland and 106 hectares of hay field. And again, things are going well.

The entire force of party influence must be brought to bear to support such initiatives and create for people conditions for highly productive labor. The local soviet and economic bodies must effectively resolve the questions of granting them long-term easy credits and provide help in material-technical support, in cultivating the lands and in building and repairing housing and production facilities.

Everyone must realize that in the zone of risky farming, where there are droughts every 3 years out of 5, the farmer or lessee must not be left alone against nature. Here it is essential to think out a range of economic and farming measures so that a person who has leased land, for instance for 50 years, be completely insured against any adversity and feel the concern of the state. In showing concern for the development of various forms for organizing labor in agriculture, we should primarily focus attention on carrying out the decisions of the March (1989) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee. Presently, the rural workers are confronted with three main tasks:

The first—to complete the spring field work at the optimum time;

Secondly, to participate in feed procurement in an organized manner;

Thirdly, to skillfully switch livestock raising to summer working conditions. Sheep shearing must also be organized.

The precipitation which fell almost everywhere during the third 10 days of April and in the first half of May, significantly replenished the moisture supplies in the soil. Good conditions were created for obtaining good sprouts of all agricultural crops. At the same time, in a majority of the republic's regions a lack of warmth is being felt. Under these conditions there cannot be any minor details in the techniques of raising one or another crop. With the necessary amount of herbicides available, we must not allow the fields to become overgrown with wild oat, particularly in the northern oblasts of the republic. We should significantly raise the role of the specialists as crop technicians and release them from unrelated administrative functions.

The protracted cold spring has had a negative effect on the grass growth. Under these conditions, it is important to make rational use of mineral fertilizers on the feed fields. Some thought must be given to what land reserves

can be used to broaden the area under perennial grasses and corn in order to supply the farms with a sufficient amount of carnage ["karnazh"] and grain haylage.

Judging from everything, we must now begin preparing for a hot, dry summer. Primarily in the dairy sector. During the current year, many oblasts have been able to achieve good rates of milk production and procurement. At present, the main thing is for these not to decline in June and July. This is why the establishing of a continuous green feed supply on each farm for the entire summer-autumn season is a primary task. We should also ensure a good supply of green feed for the individual livestock sector and an efficient organization here for the purchasing of milk and meat in the summer season.

Great harm has been caused by the spring frosts to the vegetable crops, orchards and vineyards. The vegetable fields have to be immediately resown and even now we must also commence preparations for the receiving, processing and storing of fruits, vegetables and potatoes. Here it is essential to consider the errors of last year and minimize the crop losses.

Hay procurement will be carried out under a difficult situation. Its shortfall related to the cold spring must be compensated for by shortening the time for harvesting the grasses as well as by the high quality of the feed. All fodder leftovers must be strictly accounted for and turned over to the responsible individuals.

The most crucial period has begun in livestock raising and this is the concluding of the wintering and the switch of the farms to summer operating conditions. At present, it is important not to permit a decline in farm productivity. All the fodder reserves must be skillfully employed for this.

The food potential of the last years of the five-year plan is being established precisely now. The tasks of the party organizations include shifting the center of gravity in the work to the labor collectives, into the field and under the specific conditions carry out the party's agrarian policy.

Perestroyka has brought about many new approaches also in the other spheres of economic activity aimed at satisfying social needs. Take housing construction. For the third year running now, we have steadily solved this problem and no one has even a shadow of doubt as to the successful implementation of the Program Housing-91.

Certainly, no offense meant, there were also skeptics and feint-hearted who felt this bold program to be a utopia. Let them now look at the new residential areas of the cities and villages at the famous "Kulenovka," a residential development in Ust-Kamenogorsk and unofficially named this by its residents, metallurgical workers from the lead-zinc combine, in honor of their director, A.S.

Kulenov, a passionate supporter and initiator of individual housing construction in the republic. How the cottages erected here stand out starkly—they are modern with all amenities—from those meager huts which are usually linked with the concept of the "private sector."

To a decisive degree, the success in housing construction has been aided by the circumstance that they have counted not abstract square meters but rather the rate of advancing up the waiting list to obtain apartments. The strict observance of the schedule—each month at least 10 percent of the residences of the annual quota—made it possible to efficiently organize the construction conveyor line and force them without delay to seek out and find ever-new reserves of material support.

The question reasonably arises: Where did they find the forces, the equipment and materials which with the previous much more humble pace of construction was chronically in short supply? Certainly, not by the waving of a magic wand and not from the outside. The course was set of establishing a maximum load on the housing construction combines and brick yards, many of which previously operated at 60-70 percent of their planned capacity. Having organized two- and three-shift operation at these enterprises, they were able to obtain a substantial increase in materials and structural elements.

The experience of employing binder substitutes has also been carefully studied and introduced into production. Thus, it turned out that it was possible to successfully employ the waste products of phosphorus production, the grinding of which made it possible without further processing to obtain cement substitutes of relatively high grade. Also very beneficial was the fact that the republic received permission from the CPSU Central Committee and the Union government to use above-planned metal, cement, slate and so forth for its own needs.

The accelerated completion of housing was largely aided by increasing the capacity of site-cast housing construction. The same goal was followed in having the housing construction combines begin building the shells of houses for those collectives which were unable to put them up. The finishing work was completed by the future residents themselves. Individual and cooperative construction was widely developed as well as the erection of housing by the direct labor method.

These and many other extraordinary measures made it possible to sharply increase the construction pace. Suffice it to say that over the last 3 years the people of Kazakhstan have received over 1.7 million m<sup>2</sup> of housing above the plan and in terms of the rate of construction the republic has emerged in first place in the nation. Doesn't this persuasively show the establishing of perestroika processes!

The next priority area of our work is consumer goods. Has much changed here? Judge for yourselves: while on 1 January 1985, 60 percent of all the goods sold was

shipped in from outside Kazakhstan, at present the figure is already 43 percent. The remainder is produced in the republic. And again these changes have been possible due to perestroika.

At present we, the people of Kazakhstan, as they say, have had our hands unleashed in many areas. Life industry has begun to develop at an accelerated pace due to the rapid and cheap construction of production modules. In the quarters freed as a result of reducing various office services, we have organized the production of radio and electronic products which are in demand with the population.

Since 1988, the right has been granted us for the industrial dressing of leather and fur products. Last year alone, the republic built five shops producing leather and fur goods which are sold locally. A number of mutually advantageous contracts and agreements has been reached with foreign partners for setting up modern production to dress furs and pelts and manufacture high-fashion clothing from them. This, in turn, will help to develop the individual farms on the kolkhozes and sovkhozes specializing in fur raising.

At present, a decision is being taken which will make it possible to sharply increase the production of consumer goods in the republic. It is a question of restructuring a portion of the defense enterprise capability to produce difficult household equipment such as modern refrigerators, washing machines and sewing machines. There is every reason to hope that with the start of their production the difficulties existing in the republic in financial circulation will be significantly eliminated.

At present, the situation, let us say frankly, is not an easy one. Precisely because of this we had to turn to the corresponding Union organizations with a request for support. But not by money for emission but rather by an affirmative solution to the question of selling our existing above-planned raw material products to certain foreign states in exchange for food and industrial goods. Such freedom of action made it possible for the republic to rapidly eliminate the existing budget deficit.

As you can see, we already have numerous changes in many important directions of perestroika. But, as they say, there are more than enough difficulties. This precisely confirms the notion voiced at the April (1989) CPSU Central Committee Plenum that perestroika is not going smoothly everywhere, it is often contradictory and the results are not to the liking of many.

What is the problem here? Why do the efforts embodied in real, visible achievements still not bring satisfaction and do not provide an opportunity, having caught our breath, to say: the life of the Soviet people has become immeasurably better, richer and happier?

We feel that it is not perestroyka which is to blame for this. The course set out by the party of renewing society is the only dependable course, the only correct and to the highest degree essential one to bring the nation out of the slump. But we have allowed too many major failings to form in the economy and in social and political life to hope for their complete elimination in a short time. Here there must be constant protracted work aimed not only at solving the socioeconomic but also the psychological and moral-educational problems.

In this context it may seem to some that, as before, people are being urged to tighten their belts and throw themselves headlong into heady work without any hope of any improvements in the near future? No, such a posing of the question would be fundamentally wrong and contradict the hopes and aspirations of the people who have borne too many heavy sacrifices. The party has chosen a different way, a way that is more concrete and meets the urgent needs of the population. This is: along with a gradual and consistent offensive along the entire broad front of perestroyka, to focus the main attention on the priority, most acute social problems and at whatever the cost achieve their resolution in a short period of time.

To try now to cover everything at once and encompass the unencompassable would mean to squander our energies, to erode the dam of perestroyka and undermine the confidence of the people in the party and its revolutionary ideas. In no instance must we permit this.

Proceeding from the existing situation, we must very carefully, I would say, painstakingly, approach the assessment of what has been achieved and in no way give way to euphoria over the intermediate successes. Time does not permit us to wait until someone "irons out" one or another problem. We must, in anticipating events, ourselves seek out the sore spots and the methods of eliminating them, be this the food, housing, ecological, interethnic or any other question.

It is time to fully realize that up to now Kazakhstan has held one of the last places in the nation in terms of the standard of living. Per capita commodity turnover in 1985 was 984 rubles a year in the republic while at present it is 1,071 rubles. Seemingly, there has been some growth. But as an average for the nation, the figure is 1,282 rubles and in Estonia even more, 1,965 rubles. As you can see, we have very far to go to reach these goals.

And certainly the per capita commodity turnover is an indicator of the purchasing power of people and, consequently, their standard of living. What are the reasons for the lag? There are at least three of them. In the first place, there is the objective factor of the significant number of large families in the republic. In them for each employed person there is a larger number of children and dependents than in the other regions of the nation.

Secondly, in our republic scientific-intensive production which provides national income is on a low level. Thirdly, there is a serious shortage of consumer goods.

Proceeding from these factors, we must organize our work and find effective approaches to resolving the entire range of problems.

Evoking a broad response in the republic were the materials from the last session of the Kazakh Supreme Soviet which took up a range of questions related to public health. There is no reason to repeat the numerous facts characterizing the extremely low degree of development for this literally vital social sphere. The level of public health and its physical plant are wide open to criticism. The most elementary is lacking. In many rayons per inhabitant there is a little more than 100 liters of water a day which is 5-fold below the standard. Need one go any farther for other reasons for the high rate of tuberculosis, viral hepatitis, acute intestinal infections and the unacceptably high infant mortality?

And although recently as a result of the emergency measures taken, certain changes for the better can begin to be seen, in particular, we have finally fulfilled the quotas for completing public health facilities, our lag behind the other Union republics as before is enormous. In order to catch up to their level we must work hard and for more than a year.

Or take the questions of housing construction about which many people are already accustomed to speak with legitimate pride. Yes, the approaches found have substantially altered the state of affairs for the better. But would it not be wise for someone to throw some "cold water" on a head spinning from success? Certainly the task which is being carried out is a minimal one and to a certain degree it meets the interests of only those persons on the waiting list who have a housing area of less than 6 m<sup>2</sup> per family member and we can make them happy with just 9 m<sup>2</sup> per person and no more.

But even here cunning is essential: we close our eyes to the fact that thousands upon thousands of people are still living in earth houses, waddle homes which would be an insult to call human habitation. And they are not on the list because they live in the so-called "private sector."

Literally just a few days ago, I happened to be on a visit to Guryev Oblast which is the most remote. I must admit your heart is torn when you have to see the harsh domestic conditions under which people must live. And not for a year or two, but for their entire life! We must specially request the republic television to film these and other settlements located in different oblasts where the situation is scarcely any better in order to show these frames to the participants of today's aktiv. When you look at them, I am confident you will understand what strong feelings can rage in a person.



This is what comes to mind in this context. In the course of the recent previous elections of the USSR People's Deputies, a portion of the prominent party and soviet leaders of a rather high rank did not receive the confidence of the voters. Even the leaders of Leningrad were rejected. There they held a joint plenum of the party obkom and gorkom on the election results and you are probably familiar with the materials of this from the press. If you recall, the plenum concluded that one of the main reasons which had a negative impact on the attitude of the voters to the candidates from among the leadership was their poor attention to social problems in the city. And is it really true, for instance, that people in Kzyl-Orda or Uralsk, Chimkent or Karaganda live better than in Leningrad? And here the party leaders in the course of the electoral campaign did not feel even the slightest discomfort!

Of course, it is not a question that our leaders pay more attention to the social problems than do the Leningrad ones. Quite the contrary. And it is not a question that the inhabitants of the Kazakhstan interior are completely satisfied with their position. Rather it is a question of the particular tactfulness of people and, possibly, even their inherent ethnic restraint and humility which does not allow them to express decisive disagreement with living conditions unworthy of man. For them even insignificant changes for the better which we have succeeded in achieving mean a great deal and people out of their generosity at times are willing to be generous toward their leaders.

However, seemingly, some do not take this circumstance into account and the fact of their unanimous election as a USSR deputy is viewed by them as a result of the actually achieved enormous changes and personal accomplishments. Of course, this is not the case at all! I feel that in the situation of the developing democracy and glasnost, people very quickly realize who is who and cease being condescending to the leaders who are disdainful of their needs and requests.

We must learn the ability to anticipate possible conflicts and promptly eliminate social tension. A good example of this would be the recently adopted decree of the Kazakh Council of Ministers aimed at providing extraordinary social aid to a number of republic rayons which have fallen behind in their development and are in a particularly grievous situation. Before the end of the current five-year plan, we plan to complete 200,000 m<sup>2</sup> of housing and in the following five-year plan, another million m<sup>2</sup>. In addition, there are plans to build general education schools with 63,500 seats as well as a large number of rayon hospitals, polyclinics, housing-utility and cultural-service facilities.

It would be a good thing if the leaders of the ministries and departments responsible for carrying out the given decree would increase their sense of responsibility for the rational use of the allocated funds and would not take a formal attitude toward the assigned job but rather an

effective one, considering not only the current but also the future needs of the inhabitants of these rayons. We should build so that the settlements located even in the most remote interior have comfortable housing with sewage, water and heat supply, good roads and so forth.

Thought must also be given to providing centralized food supply for the remote rayons. At present, the food supplies allocated to the oblasts are distributed on an average basis, without considering the real situation in one or another rayon. For this reason, we still cannot talk about any particular concern or priority attention to those who have an acute need for this.

The solution to these and other urgent tasks is closely linked to the level of responsibility shown by the party, soviet and economic leaders for carrying out their assigned duties. It is no accident that the April (1989) CPSU Central Committee Plenum paid such close attention to precisely this moral aspect which characterizes the makeup of a communist and member of an elective party body.

Unfortunately, it must be stated that in our republic far from all the communists who have been given the particular trust of party comrades are profoundly aware of their role in establishing perestroyka. There are instances showing not only the passive conduct on the part of certain party leaders but also actions by them which run directly counter to the party's demands and cause direct harm to party authority.

Thus, in March of the current year the republic newspaper KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA published a critical article entitled "Double Counting" on the essential shortcomings in the activities of the Taskeskenskiy Party Raykom in Semipalatinsk Oblast as well as the flagrant violations committed in the rayon in the standards of party life and social justice. Literally several days later, the Kazakhstan CP Central Committee received from the Semipalatinsk Obkom a refutation of the article with the demand to "bring to order" the journalist who had dared criticize the rayon leaders. A special commission had to be convened for studying the conflict. And so additional details came out in the course of its work.

It turned out that along with the First Secretary of the Taskeskenskiy Party Raykom D.S. Sultanov, holding the position of the deputy chief of the ideological section was his wife, A.S. Akhmetova, whom the workers from the apparatus called behind her back the "mistress." And not without grounds. For example, Akhmetova wanted to obtain a car out of turn so the raykom buro handed down a corresponding decision justifying it by the fact of "an improvement in the organization of Marxist-Leninist education in the rayon."

A similar attitude toward the distribution of social goods was characteristic also of a number of other party committee leaders. For instance, the raykom secretary, N.I. Boskova, for a long time lived in a hotel but she paid the



bill of 310 rubles only 9 months later, after the members of the inspecting commission had indicated to her the inadmissibility of such debts. Having a family of four persons, Boskova occupied a detached house with an area of almost 80 m<sup>2</sup>, realizing perfectly well that this was assigned for a large family of persons on the waiting list.

The immorality of the leaders is even more starkly reflected in the mores prevailing in the rayon. Here is just one characteristic example. Last year, in a rural holiday at the Tasbulak Sovkhoz, they organized an amusement: on the top of a slippery pole they hung the key to an apartment. The most agile and strongest would be the new resident since a disabled person or a mother with a large family could never get up the pole....

Incidentally, it is generally known that this sovkhoz is one of the worst in the rayon in terms of the production indicators and its director, O. Chaykenov, is not only incapable of running things properly but has also been guilty of flagrant arbitrariness against the farm workers. However, all of this means nothing to him. And this is not surprising since O. Chaykenov knows how to please the superiors: on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the loss-ridden sovkhoz, he organized a banquet which was attended by the very first secretary of the party raykom, Sultanov.

In a word, the check showed that there actually was a bad "double" counting in assessing the unjust deeds of the communist leaders in the rayon and probably also in the oblast.

Of course, these facts are out of the ordinary and demonstrate not so much irresponsibility as the violating of the standards of ordinary human morality by the communists. But quite often one encounters an improper attitude on the part of party members to the observance of Soviet laws and to the execution of party decisions. And often, as they say, they look through their fingers at these misdeeds.

The people are sincerely pleased that perestroyka has provided a powerful impetus for the development of democratization and glasnost and has opened up broad areas for the political activities of the masses. At the same time, one cannot help but note the ancillary phenomena which occur here of a clearly negative sort. It is no secret that individuals, including, unfortunately, communists, have endeavored to replace democracy with permissiveness and have not stopped short of actions which would lead to an undermining of constitutional legality.

In assessing the arising situation and in drawing historical parallels, we will again discover a surprising similarity between the events which occurred at the dawn of Soviet power and in the current transitional period in the life of our society. Here is what V.I. Lenin said in a report at the Second All-Russian Congress of Political

Educators in 1921: "When the people had converted to the new economic conditions, they rushed to discuss what would emerge from this and how this had to be organized in a new manner. Without going through the general discussions, nothing could be started because the people had been kept for scores and hundreds of years under a prohibition of discussing anything and the revolution could not develop except through a period of universal meetings on all questions." And one other aspect which is very important for our times: "If we promptly learn to separate from the holding of meetings what is essential to hold the meetings and what is essential for management, only then will we be able to achieve the heights for the Soviet republic."

Thus, V.I. Lenin very clearly distinguished the questions which could be given, so to speak, a "meetinghouse" resolution and the problems of economic management which required for implementation not an outburst of popular emotion but rather profound, thorough reflection by competent specialists. "We should remember," cautioned Lenin, "that our nation is a nation which has lost a great deal and has been impoverished and we must learn to hold meetings so as not to confuse, as I have said, what is essential for holding the meetings and what is essential for management. Hold meetings but also manage without the slightest hesitation, manage more firmly than the capitalist before you. Otherwise, you will not be victorious over him. You must understand that management should be stricter and even firmer than before."

The current leadership of the CPSU Central Committee is steadfastly carrying out this Leninist course of the greatest possible rise in discipline and responsibility and hardening the demands for the end results of perestroyka. Here is what M.S. Gorbachev said at one of the meetings with the apparatus of the CPSU Central Committee: "The people will not follow the leaders and cadres who are rich in promises but not in deeds, who follow the old methods and defend positions of parasitism and the principles of a residual approach to social matters. The party should take all these questions under control. And make demands, comrades! Make demands! Only then will the people feel the vanguard role of the party in perestroyka."

Of course, some do not find firm control and strict demands to their liking. Particularly those who under the cover of perestroyka slogans would like to replace democracy with anarchy and permissiveness and turn the rights and freedoms provided by perestroyka against the observance of Soviet laws.

The situation is further exacerbated by the fact that in the new, still unfamiliar situation certain party committees, soviet, trade union and law-enforcement bodies show confusion and actually hold back the work of strengthening discipline and law and order. As a result, the crime situation in the republic has recently deteriorated significantly. Thus, over the 4 months of the

current year, crime has risen by 31.5 percent and its serious types by almost 41 percent. A particularly alarming situation has risen in Alma-Ata, Kuryev, Dzhambul, Karaganda, Taldy-Kurgan, Uralsk and Tselinograd Oblasts.

This is why the urgent necessity has arisen of discussing the question of strengthening discipline and law and order as a most important condition for further establishing perestroika at the next Kazakhstan CP Central Committee Plenum.

At present, intense preparations are underway for this plenum and the appropriate approaches are being worked out. Recently, a plenum of the Kazsovsprof [Kazakh Trade Union Council] was held with the agenda "On Immediate Measures to Eliminate the Factors Giving Rise to Socioeconomic Conflicts in the Labor Collectives." A corresponding campaign is getting underway in the mass information media. Thus, there is every reason to expect that by the Central Committee Plenum we will be able to work out a number of constructive ideas and proposals. Here the main aim is to erect a solid barrier against any manifestations of illegality and lack of discipline and which undermine the stable situation in the republic and disrupt the economy, causing harm to the fundamental interests of the workers.

Comrades! At present, the basic burden of responsibility for the course of perestroika rests on the shoulders of the republic party organization, the Kazakhstan CP Central Committee, the republic Council of Ministers and Supreme Soviet, as well as the oblast subdivisions of the party, soviet and economic bodies. Solid support is coming from those who very recently received the mandate of the people's trust. The new deputy corps is a serious and reliable force capable of assuming a goodly portion of the difficult perestroika burden.

However, along with a feeling of optimistic expectation, one is also beginning to feel a certain concern. Already 6 weeks have passed, a period which is substantial according to current times, and many deputies still have not begun to implement those programs which brought them the trust of the voters.

Moreover, the impression is being created that certain elect of the people, like their former rivals, have devoted too much energy to the pre-election campaign and now are unable to "catch their breath" to finally be fully concerned with specific matters. For example, the People's Deputy and Chief of the Alma-Ata Housing Construction Combine Design and Construction Association A.K. Safonov and his opponent, the First Secretary of the Alma-Ata Party Gorkom V.I. Romanov, at meetings with the voters literally slugged it out, promising the uninterrupted fulfillment of the Housing-91 Program in the city. And in a check more than 1,000 departments were not completed over the first quarter. I feel that this would not cause great happiness amongst the voters.

There are also delegates who are counting on their breakthrough strength, arguing that they would request what is required in the high-level offices of Moscow or Alma-Ata. At present, such a trick does not work. As they say, the squeaking wheel gets the grease but now we would put it, roll up your sleeves and forget about a parasitic position which now does not reap any dividends.

At the same time, it is clear that each elect of the people should have normal conditions for working with the voters and for exercising his organizational functions. This would include a permanent office at the executive committee or in another convenient place, a telephone, transportation and so forth. The local soviets should be promptly concerned with this.

As analysis shows, the deputy corps has become significantly more diverse in its composition. It includes communists and nonparty persons, persons of different ages and careers, at times with unusual and even eccentric views about solving various problems. Proceeding from this, at present, on the eve of the Congress of People's Deputies, there is the particularly urgent question of consolidating the people's elect, their unanimity and unity in what concerns the fundamental interests of the people, the interests of perestroika.

I am saying this because there are definite centrifugal forces which are endeavoring to split the congress before it starts and establish groupings which express coalition interests. One of the numerous proofs of this is the comment in the newspaper MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI stating that in Moscow a group of delegates has met, some 15 persons, for discussing important questions of deputy activities. What problem concerned the people's elect? It turns out, the distribution of the fees between the deputies working "behind the Kremlin walls" and all the others. Is this not truly the most "crucial" question today?

It is essential to bear in mind that at the Congress completely unacceptable proposals may be put forward under the pretext of protecting perestroika. It is no secret, for example, that certain newly elected deputies have been openly in favor of abrogating the decree of the presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet "On the Procedure for Organizing and Conducting Assemblies, Meetings, Street Parades and Demonstrations in the USSR." Please note: it is a question of the ukase and the procedure for the conduct. Hence, those who are against it in essence are the opponent of order in conducting various social measures and are favoring anarchy in our society. Can such a demand be acceptable for a mature person who has been given the trust of the people? I feel that here there is only one answer. Democracy is the power of the people and any power does not exist without discipline and order. There is no democracy without them.

Each people's deputy should have dependable civil immunity against the dangerous intrigues of the opponents of perestroika regardless of whatever ultrademocratic clothing they may wear. Together with the people's elect of the other fraternal republics, we should decisively affirm universal justice and not regional, we should support what contributes to the strengthening of the USSR and does not separate the peoples into individual nationality quarters.

In this context, the people of Kazakhstan are greatly concerned with the phenomena which have occurred in certain regions of the nation and in no way contribute to an improvement in interethnic relations. There large social organizations are being set up along nationality lines, labels such as "migrant" which insult the dignity of citizens are being attached, absurd but in no way harmless demands are being voiced for establishing "their own" national army, "their own" money and so forth.

Does all of this have any bearing on the perestroika processes? Of course not! Certainly the aim of perestroika, as was pointed out in the report at the ceremony honoring the 70th anniversary of October, is "...theoretically and practically to restore completely the Leninist notion of socialism in which the unchanging priority is for the working man, for his ideals, interests, for humanistic values in the economy, social and political relations and in culture."

I feel that the forthcoming Congress of USSR People's Deputies and later the CPSU Central Committee Plenum on the questions of improving interethnic relations will provide an accurate name and assessment for the negative phenomena. One thing is clear: we must fight for what unites the peoples and decisively rebuff everything that separates them. Each person has the right to consider himself an equal in any corner of our nation and each must respect the dignity, culture and language of the people of the republic in which he lives.

Comrades! In following the spirit of the April (1989) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, we are obliged to take a more demanding approach to evaluating the work of the members of the Kazakhstan CP Central Committee, the candidate members of the Central Committee and members of the Auditing Commission. It must be confessed that we have people whose presence in

an elective party body has been caused merely by their official position and not by active involvement in the activities of the Central Committee.

There already is good experience in intensifying the work of the Central Committee members. I have in mind the decisions of the 11th Plenum of the Kazakhstan CP Central Committee in which a precise and concrete assignment was given to each Central Committee member and to each communist responsible for one or another area of perestroika.

Such a procedure must be strongly affirmed. And each Central Committee member should report regularly on the work done. It is very important to introduce this system also into the sphere of deputy activities so that each elect of the people on any level constantly feels the demand for his personal involvement in the affairs of perestroika and actively carry out the instructions of the voters.

If a certain official, holding the status of a deputy, feels that it is possible, as before, to sit idle and rest on his deputy laurels and that the chair held makes it possible to avoid responsibility to the voters, under present-day conditions the prestigious button on the lapel of his jacket will scarcely remain long.

As was said at the April (1989) CPSU Central Committee Plenum, the Central Committee Politburo will constantly introduce the practice of hearing reports by the ministers and other leaders of the Union rank concerning the fulfillment of their official duties and the course of perestroika at the areas of work assigned to them. The same must be done on all levels of the republic party and soviet bodies. Stricter demands must be placed on each member of a party committee and on each deputy for carrying out priority tasks whether this be food supply, housing construction, consumer goods production, or the strengthening of discipline and law and order. And if these fundamental problems do not obtain their proper resolution, then serious thought must be given to whether this person should be the member of a party committee or the people's elect or if it would be better for him to give up his powers sooner.

Please understand me correctly. It is not a question of any across-the-board purge or a total offensive against the pensioners. No, it is a question of the urgent need to sharply increase the responsibility of the communists and the deputies for the assigned job. Ultimately the fate of perestroika depends upon this now.

**Ukrainian Exarch Speaks Out Against Uniate,  
Ukrainian Autocephalous Churches**

*18110099 Kiev SILSKI VISTI in Ukrainian  
19 May 89 p 3*

[Article by SILSKI VISTI correspondent V. Karpiy:  
"For Humanitarianism and Charity: From Press Confer-  
ence by Metropolitan Filaret, Exarch of the Ukrainian,  
at the Lvov-Drogobych Eparchial Administration"]

[Text] Article 52 of our country's Constitution reads:  
"Citizens of the USSR are guaranteed freedom of con-  
science, that is, the right to profess any religion or to  
profess none at all, to perform religious rites or to  
conduct atheist propaganda. It is prohibited to stir up  
hostility and hatred in connection with religious beliefs."

This was recalled at a press conference held in Lvov by  
Metropolitan of Kiev and Galicia Filaret, Patriarchal  
Exarch of the Ukraine, in connection with the Easter  
holidays.

In an introductory statement preceding an unusually  
interesting interview with journalists, he stated: "We are  
presently living in a time of perestroika, democratiza-  
tion, and glasnost. This time also applies to the Russian  
Orthodox Church; new opportunities have opened up  
before it...."

Just what are these opportunities?

Metropolitan Filaret cited a number of facts illustrating  
the above thesis.

Take, for example, the registration of religious congre-  
gations. 800 new religious congregations have recently  
begun functioning just in our republic alone, and this  
process is continuing. The state is guaranteeing freedom  
of conscience not in word but in deed. During the days of  
celebration of the 1,000th anniversary of Christianity in  
Russia the world-famous Kiev Cave Monastery  
[Kyievo-Pecherska Lavra] was returned to the church,  
and the Hoshivska Monastery in the Western Ukraine  
received the faithful....

In short, the state is doing a great deal toward the  
humanization of society and is returning to religious  
believers their legal rights to freedom of conscience. A  
law on freedom of conscience will soon be adopted; it  
will become one more guarantee of the great spiritual  
rights of Soviet citizens.

What is the position of the Russian Orthodox Church  
toward society? What contribution is it making toward  
perestroika and democratization of our lives?

"The church's contribution to perestroika consists first  
and foremost in elevating the spiritual and moral life of  
society," noted the Exarch of the Ukraine. "We cannot  
conceive of perestroika without this."

"As we know, the Russian Orthodox Church has recently  
been doing a great deal of civic work. Take, for example,  
the Committee For the Defense of Peace. Our church is  
a participant in this committee; the church's word in  
support of disarmament and elimination of all stockpiles  
of nuclear weapons is ringing out throughout the world."  
The Metropolitan stressed that in recent months repre-  
sentatives of the Russian Orthodox Church, including he  
himself, have taken part in dozens of various forums of  
peace advocates, have visited more than 60 countries  
throughout the world, and have met with presidents,  
prime ministers, and prominent civic leaders on all  
continents; the main theme of their talks has been the  
issue of peace and improvement of relations between  
countries and between East and West. The Russian  
Orthodox Church is engaged in similar efforts pertaining  
to establishing contacts among the various religions  
professed by the world's peoples.

Or take the All-Union Children's Fund imeni V. I.  
Lenin; the Russian Orthodox Church is also very  
actively involved in this fund. It also actively promotes  
other charitable foundations.

"We are making a large contribution to these founda-  
tions," stated Metropolitan Filaret. "Religious believers  
from our republic alone contribute more than 8 million  
rubles each year to these funds."

Humanitarianism and compassion guided this republic's  
religious believers when they learned of the great tragedy  
befalling the Armenian people—the earthquake. The  
church collected more than 1 million rubles among  
religious believers in the Ukraine and sent this money to  
Armenia.

"The main thing for our church is to instill in people a  
feeling of compassion, to instill in men's souls a sym-  
pathy and shared suffering, which unfortunately were  
wrongly forced out of our lives during the years of the  
Stalin regime and the period of stagnation," emphasized  
Metropolitan Filaret. "Perestroika, the democratization  
of society, and glasnost have become fertile soil for these  
goals."

Journalists questioned the Exarch of the Ukraine about  
the Russian Orthodox Church's position toward the  
Uniate Church and attempts by certain persons to revive  
the Uniate Church in the western oblasts of the Ukraine.

"The church is unequivocally against it," replied Metro-  
politan Filaret. "The people have condemned the Uniate  
Church as an instigator of enmity between peoples and  
among individuals within our nation. We do not want  
enmity among religious believers."

Metropolitan Filaret proceeded to discuss the history of  
development of the Uniate Church in the Ukraine and  
characterized it in an exhaustive manner.

"The lands of the East Slavs were always a target of expansion by the Vatican, attempting to expand Roman Catholicism among that population which named its church the Russian Orthodox Church immediately following the reign of Prince Vladimir, that is, even before our nations had been formed, when the people in Rus lived as tribal or clan groups." Attempts by the Vatican to Catholicize Rus and to conquer the Russian lands always ended in failure. It is true that Roman Catholicism succeeded in gaining a partial foothold in the Baltic, in the Western Ukraine, and in Belorussia. The overwhelming masses, however, actively resisted the foreign enslavers and bearers of an alien religion. In 1596 the Vatican imposed the so-called Union of Brest, according to which the Russian Orthodox Church supposedly united with the Roman Catholic Church; but the Slavic population and the Russian Orthodox Church did not recognize and to this day has not recognized this artificial "unification," which pursued far-reaching aims of conquest. The people viewed Roman Catholicism as alien with reason, equating it with foreign enslavement. This is attested by many instances of peasant revolts against the foreign oppressors.

The long and intensive struggle by the masses against the Uniate Church and Roman Catholicism and for their Orthodox faith became a form of consolidation of all progressive forces within the people for social and national liberation. In time rebellion in the Ukraine escalated into a national liberation war led by Bogdan Khmelnytskyi. In 1654 it ended in victory with the Council of Pereiaslavl, which adopted a historic decision calling for reunification of the Ukraine with Russia.

The Ukraine's western lands, however, remained for a considerable time under a foreign heel. The Uniate Church was imposed in these areas. But the overwhelming majority of the people refused to accept it, holding to the Orthodox faith. And there were even those among the Uniate clergy who demanded reunification of the Greek Catholic Church, which held sway in the Western Ukraine, with the Russian Orthodox Church. In March 1946 the Lvov Synod, at the demand of religious believers, adopted a resolution denouncing the Brest Union and severing its ties with the Vatican. 3000 congregations separated from the Uniate Church and went over to Russian Orthodoxy. This was due in particular to the fact that in the Western Ukraine the Uniate Church had earned ill repute. The Uniate leadership had been outright accomplices of fascism and Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism and had acted as punishers of those who had refused to submit to the Hitlerites.

Although the coercive union in the Western Ukraine is a thing of the past, to this day top Vatican officials have not given up hopes of reviving the Uniate Church in the Ukraine and are spreading slanderous lies about the plight of religious believers in the Ukraine, especially in the western oblasts. "Concern" over the fate of the "oppressed" Ukrainian people is clearly manifested in the Vatican's "Eastern policy." The ideologues of

Roman Catholicism openly support those reactionary circles in the West which have declared "psychological war" against genuine socialism; it is being waged on a hysterical anti-Soviet pitch.

Once again imperialist reactionaries are calling loudly for a "crusade" both against the Soviet Union and against the countries of the socialist community. They pursue their policy with particular persistence during a period of crisis situations in individual socialist countries. This is apparent from the examples of Hungary (1956), Czechoslovakia (1968), and Poland (1981). No sooner had counterrevolutionary elements in these countries begun stirring up trouble, when clergymen marched to the forefront, inspired and instigated by the pushers of the Vatican's "Eastern Policy." As is apparent, any weakening of the unity of the new social system or errors in practical implementation of the principles of socialism result in stepped-up efforts on the part of anti-Communist elements, including clerical elements, who call for the destruction of the foundations of socialism....

Aware of this fact, adherents of the Russian Orthodox Church are resolutely opposed to establishment of a Kievan-Vatican Patriarchate, which is so desired by devotees of the Uniate Church.

Nor is there any need, stated the Exarch of the Ukraine, for rebirth of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church. Back in 1940 the leaders of the Russian Orthodox Church gave permission to conduct church services in the Ukraine in the local language. The journal PRAVO-SLAVNYI VISNYK [Orthodox Herald] is published in the Ukrainian language, the New Testament has been translated into Ukrainian, and next year it will be republished in a very large press run. A prayer book has been published in Old Church Slavonic, in Ukrainian transcription. As of this year Ukrainian language and literature as a curriculum subject is being introduced at the theological seminary. A theological seminary may be established in Kiev, at which classes will be taught in the Ukrainian language.

"Our church is in favor of development of the Ukrainian language, literature, and culture," clarified Metropolitan Filaret. "We are firmly opposed to interethnic enmity. The Russian Orthodox Church considers all nations equal. At the same time we are in favor of a dialogue with the Roman Catholic Church; such a dialogue has already begun. Therefore one can anticipate improvement in relations between the two churches."

The fact that relations between the two churches—Russian Orthodox and Roman Catholic—are improving thanks to perestroika is eloquently attested by the celebration of the thousandth anniversary of the adoption of Christianity in Russia. More than 10 Roman Catholic cardinals took part in the celebrations. This was unique in the history of relations between the two churches. This means that a dialogue can be held, but Rome should not seek revival of the Union, which the Ukrainian people

rejected. As for the Russian Orthodox Church, it is for unity of peoples, for respect of one nation for another, and for nonintervention in the internal affairs of peoples. It teaches its followers love of the homeland and respect for all peoples. It is for cooperation with unofficial organizations which do not do harm to society.

The interview between the Exarch of the Ukraine and representatives of the mass media proved beneficial. I believe that it will also be of interest to the general public. It is for this reason that I am acquainting the readers of *SIL'SKI VISTI* with a number of problems which the Russian Orthodox Church is addressing in the Ukraine. And this too is unquestionably a sign of perestroika, democratization of the affairs of our society, and the triumph of glasnost in all its domains.

M. P. Kolesnyk, chairman of the UkSSR Council of Ministers Religious Affairs Council, Nykodym, Metropolitan of Lvov and Drobych, and representatives of the higher clergy took part in the press conference.

#### **Industries, Offices To Make Way for Church, Cultural Preserve**

18001129a Moscow *SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA* in Russian 24 May 89 p 4

[Article by A. Vyatkin: "A Church Returns to Life"]

[Text] Restoration has begun on the Pokrovskiy cathedral, the first stone structure in Kharkov, erected by unknown workmen 300 years ago. The building is distinguished by its balance of form and the elegance of its ornamentation. It is a striking example of Russian-Ukrainian architecture.

The rebirth of the former church is part of a grand project for beautifying the main historical zone of the city. Here, spread over 1,500 hectares, are located more than 400 valuable architectural, historical, and cultural monuments. Teams of restorers, architects, and builders are systematically restoring them to good order.

Some 40 establishments and offices, 20 industries, and 7 parking lots will be moved outside the borders of the protected zone. Public gardens, flower beds, and areas for relaxation will be created in great number.

Someday the renovated church, gleaming with gilt and bright colors, will appear before the inhabitants and guests of Kharkov in all its beauty, giving joy to all who understand and value art.

#### **Ivano-Frankovsk Officials Impede Practice of Religious Faith**

18001129b Moscow *ARGUMENTY I FAKTY* in Russian No 21, 27 May-2 Jun 89 p 3

[Appeal by V. Semotyuk: "Right to a Place of Worship"]

[Text] I was born and grew up in a peasant family. Without regard for my life, I defended our Soviet Motherland during the war years alongside all the other

faithful citizens. I was then, and still remain, faithful to the Russian Orthodox Church. I constantly prayed for God to help us overcome fascism and to return us home alive after the victory. My prayers were answered: I returned home.

After the war I helped rebuild our country and worked on a local collective farm despite the wound I had received from a fascist bullet. I went to church and prayed that those terrible years never be repeated. When I was 68 years old my strength abandoned me and, because I had always been a manual laborer, I retired on a pension.

At that time the organs of power closed the church in our village. And all the faithful came to pray at the closed church. One beautiful day the local authorities, without consulting the people, arrived with several militiamen and dogs, cordoned off the church, and some young people we did not know barbarically tore down the church with machinery and ropes. They destroyed the archives and all the artifacts of our ancient culture. I realize that was the period of stagnation, but the people asked that the church be made into a museum and no one even wanted to listen to them. Later the chairman of the collective farm was punished because the church turned out to be an ancient and valuable monument. My countrymen went to worship in the neighboring villages. But I am an old man, 88 years old, a category II invalid, and I cannot walk far. I built a little chapel outside my home. I wanted to set it up on a vacant lot next to my home, but the local authorities would not allow it. It did not matter where I went—to the rayon, to the oblast; instead of helping me, they threatened me with fines and even said that they would come to my home and break up my little chapel.

My fellow villagers and I threw ourselves into battle with the cursed enemy for this land, I fought to my last drop of blood. Haven't I earned myself a little plot of ground?

I am an old man and I do not have long to live. Let me put up my chapel. Let the faithful, and I with them, pray for a lasting peace for the world so that our generation and our children may not know the horrors of war, which we endured.

[Signed] V. Semotyuk, Il'netsy village, Ivano-Frankovsk Oblast.

#### **Estonian Religious Leaders Meet With State Officials**

18001129c Tallinn *SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA* in Russian 19 Apr 89 p 2

[Article by O. Laev: "Meeting With Church Leaders"]

[Text] On 17 April I. Toome, chairman of the Estonian SSR Council of Ministers, met in Toompea with members of the Estonian Council of Churches and leaders of

all the religious faiths practicing in the republic. Attending the meeting were Kuno Payula, archbishop of the Estonian Evangelical Lutheran Church; Aleksiy, metropolitan of the Leningrad and Novgorod eparchies and steward of the Tallinn eparchy; Olav Pyarnamets, superintendent of the Estonian Methodist Church; Yulo Meriloo, senior presbyter of Evangelical Christian Baptists in the Estonian SSR; Aarne Kriysk, senior presbyter of Seventh Day Adventists in the Estonian SSR; and clergymen of several other communities.

I. Toome told the church leaders about the social and political situation in the country and about guidelines the Estonian SSR government is pursuing to overcome negative trends in the development of society. I. Toome noted with gratitude the role that religious organizations are playing in the implementation of perestroyka in Estonia, emphasizing in this context the church's efforts to put into practice the ideas of ethics in society, spiritual education and Christian charity, and care for the sick, elderly, and lonely.

The state and church have many opportunities for joint action. I. Toome thanked the church leaders for the understanding which religious organizations have displayed in their cooperation with state and public organizations.

The meeting in Toompea led to increased possibilities for that cooperation; it especially needs to be developed on the local level—in the cities and rayons.

The church leaders expressed their opinions about trends in the development of our society. Much has changed in relations with the church. It was noted that last year the executive committees of the local soviets gave concrete material aid for the repair and renovation of public monuments of antiquity—religious [kul'tovyy] objects. At the same time the church leaders requested a quick decision on the return of church property, etc., forcibly appropriated from them in past decades. Discussions also took place on many other issues which limit church activities today, as well as how the state might show the churches support.

The church leaders affirmed that all the religious organizations functioning in the Estonian SSR support the policies of perestroyka and the activities of the Estonian SSR government to implement them; and they expressed the hope that the activities of the recently created Council of Churches of Estonia will, on its side, help to strengthen ties between church and state.

Both sides remarked on the usefulness of the present meeting and the necessity of further such exchanges of opinions in the future.

The meeting was also attended by R. Ristlaan, envoy to the Estonian SSR of the Council for Religious Affairs under the USSR Council of Ministers.

**Film Union Plenum Debates Artistic Freedom, Commercialization**

18001118 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA  
in Russian 23 May 1989 pp 3-4

[Article by G. Simanovich, P. Smirnov: "Artistic Freedom. What Next? Day One: Seekers of Truth or Filmmakers?"]

[Text] What a range of topics our filmmakers have discussed and disputed during the 3 years since their unforgettable Fifth Congress. They have covered the new cinematic model, the independence of film studios, the relations between the Filmmakers' Union and USSR Goskino, film [i.e., the material], the dictates of the film renting agency, equipment, ways to earn foreign exchange, the need to be screened internationally, and many other large and small issues related to modern filmmaking.

But finally they have come around to speaking of the most important thing, absolutely the most important—art, that which is precisely the goal of perestroika in the film industry. The current regular session of the plenum of the Filmmakers Union Board was devoted to renewal of the artistic consciousness. We have decided to move away from the traditional chronological list in reporting on this session and to present the material that was discussed in a kind of "round table," at which the participants in the plenum express, what seems to us to be the most important and essential concepts, challenging and supplementing each other.

[A. Smirnov, film director, Moscow] We have to realize that the opportunities which were granted to us after our fifth congress were greater than those afforded to any other generation of Soviet filmmakers. How are we making use of them? This is the issue of artistic freedom—do we understand it as a negative quantity, as the absence of impediments, or does it imply some positive force, the creative potential of the individual. Have our films improved by even an iota? The relative revitalization of interest on the part of the audience can, without any doubt, be attributed to the expansion of the range of what is permitted: if you feel like it, you can make a film about a prostitute, or a drug addict, or a forced labor camp. The film "Thieves in the Law" has made quite a sensation, and "Intergirl" is on the verge of being released.

The plan for next year's topics include nearly 15 fictional pictures made by various studios entitled literally: "the story of a demobilized Afghanistan veteran, who returns to his home town and comes into conflict with the Mafia." They are all rushing to jump on the perestroika bandwagon. One of them, who yesterday made a film based on a book by a general of the State Security Agency, today is making a picture about the victims of Stalinism. Someone else who recently made a comedy with half naked girls, now is announcing a film about a repressed party leader. A third, who has only just put

together a hymn to our glorious counterintelligence in which one can feel the fine hand of Yulian Semenov, is now speaking out passionately against the militarization of pioneer education.

Don't misunderstand me. I am not bothered by the stretching of the limit of what is permitted. And I think that there is no subject in our life, that could not become the object of a film study, no matter how low it is. But we are talking about something different. It is always the same thing—the right of the artist to be called an artist before the society in which he lives and works.

But doesn't it seem to you that we, who have grown accustomed to marching in formation, have simply turned around at the command "about face" and are marching in the new prescribed direction? Doesn't it seem to you that the average filmmaker, has remained as ready as he ever was to jump to celebrate the latest directive? And, finally, does it not seem to you that perestroika has dramatically revealed the gaping holes in our ranks, the shortage of people capable of going against the current, the sole species of human on which any culture rests?

[Yu. Bogomolov, film critic, Moscow] Coincidentally, I had wanted to devote my contribution to a discussion of the ability to go with the current.

In our art from the very beginning, there existed proclamations and apologies for collectivism and the collective hero. But there were powerful individualists—Mayakovsky, Eisenstein, Meierhold, who were behind these proclamations and apologies. Nonetheless, individualism was always a vile imprecation according to the standards of our society. And I am afraid that for many today it is a burden that is too much to carry.

After all in the film industry too we must concern ourselves with prosaic tasks, the unhurried but logical development of the taste for individual freedom, individual responsibility, individual wealth, and individual security. Why shouldn't popular films be able to help with this by embodying on the screen the subconscious, secret thoughts, desires, and dreams of the so-called mass audience?

As for "Thieves in the Law." I will take the responsibility for asserting that the success achieved was not due to poor taste at all, but was a result of having hit upon the subconscious interests of the masses. The film touched raw nerves—the social vulnerability of the individual, his material poverty, and the squalor of his everyday existence.

No matter how ironically we treat popular art, it must be acknowledged that without this type of film we could not progress.



[Yu. Mamin, director, Leningrad] Must the director concern himself about conquest of the viewer today? Unquestionably. And this can be achieved by popular films, which the viewer perceives as a promise that he will receive the emotions he is expecting. But popular film should not be equated to commercial film. The commercial film reminds me of a situation where you think you see a sparkling coin on the street, bend down to pick it up, and find that it is the sunlight shining on spittle. While possessing a certain charm and effects which have the capacity to attract and entice, the commercial film, as rule, has nothing but the spurious to offer.

[Sovetskaya Kultura] On the subject of the "spurious" in the commercial film—what has been said is, of course, justified. But after all commercialization has been applied to serious social themes as well. Sex and the "seamy side" have been successfully incorporated in the arsenal of those who do not consider themselves commercial directors. But doesn't it happen that harsh episodes presented "without prettification" to expose the "leaden abominations" of life, are perceived by the audience as effective "attractions" which have now been permitted (for example, the thousands of letters about "Little Vera" and every one of them about the bedroom scene)?

[I. Shilova, film critic, Moscow] A reverse in direction is the easiest and the clearest route. Ceasing to flatter, the screen naturally began to expose, accuse. It offers reality, as it is—complete with dirt, disorder, basements, communal apartments...

Yes, film today is leading the reader into heretofore forbidden areas. However, the initial impulse is not so much knowledge and study as proof of a selected theorem using standard arguments.

In film after film we are given a selective character study of social figures based on revelation of their physiological needs: the raykom secretary who compensates for unpleasant aspects of his job through sexual satisfaction ("Emergency Situation on a Regional Scale"). Or the husband and wife, fulfilling their conjugal duties ("The First 100 Years are the Hardest"); or rape ("They Call Me Arlekino").

It is as if the screen is forbidding us to go beyond the circle of evils, and is warning us sternly to be on guard against premature flights, and demands that we immerse ourselves in the world of nightmare and the absurd. And this give rise to doubts. In the past the screen affirmed: be an honorable worker, a good family man and—and you will be justly rewarded; fight against iniquities and your hardwon victory will be a contribution to a brighter future of your Fatherland; defend the weak, and unite them and the world will be transformed.

Now the screen teaches us: do not set out upon the wrong path or you will never get back ("Confession. Chronicle of Alienation"); do not make yourself an idol, or your idol will turn out to be a criminal ("Tragedy in Rock Style"); do not get caught up in furthering your career, or a monster will stand on your path ("Emergency Situation on a Regional Scale").

They didn't confine themselves to just recording, on the contrary, they are growing increasingly aggressive in what they show with attractive success, and striking starkness, savoring the acts of sadism and masochism.

Doesn't it seem to you that Soviet filmmaking is becoming not so much international as foreign and is using mechanisms and devices that have already been developed abroad, that it is running after extremes, and ignoring the essence of Soviet culture and its humanistic traditions?

I dare to express the risky proposition that in its selfless exposes, in these cold sentences, intoxicated with repentance, the opportune performances—there is just about as much truth as there was in the sweet, boundlessly optimistic fairy tales of the early 1940s. At that time the audiences expected consolation. Now they expect exposes and vengeance. The film maker meets these expectations, and, to put it bluntly, gambles on them.

[L. Roshal, film scholar, playwright, Moscow] The documentary filmmaker today deals with things he did not cover in the past, whole layers of bleeding life which had been artificially withheld from the natural processes of his work. But while dealing with the new subject matter, in the bulk of his pictures, he is still going along the well-trodden path of recording information as if for a newsreel.

The superfluity of facts, even those of the most dramatic nature, the lack of interpretation, the absence of figurative understanding of the phenomena, in my view, dull the emotional perceptions of the audience to a great extent. Soon the viewer will cease to be surprised at our tales of repressions, the mafia, drug addiction, etc.

As result, on our screen—and perhaps I am putting this too strongly—there is occurring a devaluation of our national tragedy. We have had many exposes, but there is still too little sympathy and empathy. And this is true, first and foremost, of our documentary film.

For there to be new human understanding of real documentary life, there must be not only a different kind of civic thought, but also a new type artistic thinking. I believe that there are beginning to be signs of this. I would list: "The Theater in an Age of Perestroyka and Glasnost" by Ruderman, "Islands" by Gevorkyantsa, "The Lunar Sphere," by Levashova-Tumanishvili, "Brick Flag" by Birzhinis...

The power of these different films lies in their search for a synthesis of complex reality with the play of artistic imagination. They contain not only vision, but also a world-view, expressed through artistic devices.

[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA] Could it be that neo-opportunism, including political neo-opportunism, is an unavoidable concomitant of the sudden and abrupt institution of democratization and glasnost, in the absence of sufficient political, artistic, and human culture? And the screen is confirming this every day.

[V. Demin, film critic, Moscow] But, after all, glasnost too may be used in the old way, in a limited range. Elections can be turned into revenge on one's superiors, and after praying for decades to an icon with a big mustache today one can spit on it with satisfaction. Fervent prayers and violent spitting, in essence, mean the same thing: you have not changed, you were a slave in your supplication, and you remained a slave when you rebelled.

And our film has not been able to avoid the fashion for Stalin. His portraits, statues, giant monuments accompany us from film to film. So as to remind us? But how could anyone forget him? To add specific details? But, in these films it is more a case of the general outweighing the particular. Is it possible that we do not understand the ruined life of the railroad thief without seeing the beautifully photographed plaster remains of the monument in the film "Scourge of God"? Everyone can remember additional examples. In my view the director Bolot Shamshev outdid everyone. In his "Climbing of Fujiyama," the characters on a picnic take refuge in the shade of some transparencies that had been used for a holiday demonstration. One feels that Rashidov, Kunayev, Suslov, Brezhnev are taking part in the outdoor feasting. But as if this weren't enough, in the midst of the salvos fired to celebrate the holiday, there is an earthquake and a stone likeness of the Generalissimo, which was purportedly heretofore covered with sand and detritus, appears on the nearest mountain peak. How can they fail to notice that this device is suicidal for the plot.

One cannot help but be gratified at the delicacy with which, in their film "Shock," the director Ishmukhamedov and his screen writers Agipev and Iszhakov portray the phenomena of "Rashidovism" and "Adylovism" without using these names, without a new reel, and generally without shooting at a bird that has already flown.

Alas, it is more common to encounter the reverse. Today many have become hangers-on of freedom. Speculators in its name.

[V. Khotinenko, director Sverdlovsk] Things have reached a point where no matter what we start to talk about, one way or another, we end up with freedom, which is understood differently and treated differently by different people. I would like to say that the guarantee

of freedom is freedom itself. The artist, undoubtedly, requires the civil freedom, required by all citizens of our country. But in addition to that, he needs internal, artistic freedom—after all he is an artist.

[V. Bozhovich, film scholar, Moscow] And yet freedom is not only freedom "from," it is also freedom "for," and it is in this latter sense that it is internal. It is this internal freedom we have not acquired, or have acquired insufficiently. When suddenly the doors open in front of us to allow us to use it, it turns out that many of us have nothing to use...

[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA] The discussion on the first day witnessed a sobering up after the euphoria that occurred in response to the opportunities opening up after the "liberating" Fifth Congress. It seems, that it became clear to the majority that abolishing forbidden themes is no guarantee of the appearance of chef d'oeuvres. But why speak of chef d'oeuvres? Films that are simply good and vibrant, strong, and affecting are, as in the past, in noticeably short supply; as the artists themselves lack that internal, naturally sensed artistic freedom that offers not omnivorousness, but moral responsibility before art, the audience, society, and oneself.

**The second day "Socialist realist?—Yes.—You may pass."**

[V. Demin] The art of the ever-memorable years swore its major allegiance to "populism" and "party loyalty." However, the first conceded nothing to the "populism" of General Uvarov, who coined the triple formula: orthodoxy, autocracy, populism. While the second amounted to the dogmatic out-of-context use of Lenin's phrase about literature becoming the "wheels and screws of the proletariat's common cause."

The ideal of such "correct" art was and remains socialist realism. In spite of the decades of very active use of this term, with all its theoretical dubiousness, it has not died out to this day. The concept of realism is unambiguous and definite, it is not reasonable to use it in whatever way we wish to suit our political and ideological platform and deny it to anyone who gets a step out of line.

In practice it means: to approach art with nonaesthetic categories and burden it with political and propagandistic purposes, for which it is not always suitable. It is paradoxical but true that, with respect to their socialist realism, "Quiet Flows the Don" and "Cavalier of the Golden Star," figured identically in the annals of creative successes.

Such empty "features" as depiction of life in its revolutionary development, concern with the masses, a positive and active hero in the center, and the like, identify not a "method," but a system of opportunistic requirements on the part of the administrative-command system. And at the same time, apostates from that murky and mysterious "method" were publicly tarred and

expelled from Soviet art. This was the case with Eisenstein and Tanrov, with Prokofyev and Shostakovich, with Akhmatova, Zoshchenko, and Pasternak.

[S. Freylikh, film expert, Moscow]. Today we have two antagonistic cultures—the culture of Nina Andreyeva and the culture of Dmitriy Likhachev. And I think that between them there is no compromise and cannot be one.

We are speaking only about how to prevent disputes in the area of esthetics, literature, culture, and even politics from turning into a bloody battle.

I love Pushkin. But nevertheless, I would have liked the Museum of Fine arts on Bolshonka [Street] to bear the name of Ivan Vladimirovich Tsvetayev, a corresponding member of the Petersburg Academy of Sciences from 1904, and founder and first director of the Museum of Fine Arts.

It was frightening when they broke the ties with past, when they drove the poet Yosif Brodskiy, and the cellist and director Mstislav Rostropovich out of the country. Everything possible was done to prevent the film director Andrey Tarkovskiy from returning to his homeland. Why was this done? To keep the geniuses away from the action, to compromise them in the eyes of society, to expunge them from the people's memory? On the other hand they immortalized the figures of stagnation during their lifetimes. And these monuments are reminders of our spiritual slavery.

[O. Genisaretskiy, philosopher, Moscow]: We speak of the de-ideologization of culture and art. Perhaps, it was not a good idea to mention the already fading bugaboo of socialist realism, which is turning into a newspaper cliché. Perhaps, we should not have once again been ironic at the expense of "party loyalty," describing it as a technique for expressing devotion to a leader in a form accessible to him.

However, to act thus means to fail to notice that our consciousness and culture, the milieu in which we live is polluted by the slag of this previous process of ideologization and, looking at this phenomenon from the point of view of the ecological imperative, it must be said that the work confronting us is almost that of sappers, in which we must step by step go over all the places where there are mines remaining and sensors emitting signals.

#### From the Resolutions of the Plenum

"The task of researchers and critics is to continue the scientific-historical interpretation of the phenomenon of socialist realism, and to give it an objective and a conclusive appraisal..

"Artistic methods and directions are not invented by anyone and cannot be introduced according to plan. They are the natural result of the operation of the artistic

process, the product of their times, the irreproducible fruits of the labor, talent, and conscience of whole generations of artists, creating in accordance with their own sense of the world and their own vision of reality, with their own understanding of man, truth, and moral values...

"The plenum resolves to withdraw from the preamble of the Charter of the USSR Filmmakers Union the paragraph affirming the priority of methods of socialist realism for the Soviet filmmaking."

[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA] Today many speak and write about the fact that, through the efforts of the dogmatists and the time-servers, socialist realism was given the unattractive aspect of a dogma, interfering with the living process of artistic development. It is difficult not to agree, but.. If only the removal of the offending point from the charter could affect a magic transformation of craftsmen into talented seekers of truth, and the opportunists of film into honorable artists!

It would seem that dogma in art can only die out through natural means and not with the aid of resolutions, even the most progressive and correct resolutions. But the criteria will be truth, spirituality and freedom, the road to which is sought today by art in a society undergoing perestroika.

#### Day Three. Soviet Film: In Rubles Or Dollars?

[K. Razlogov, film expert, Moscow] It is no accident that here on the stage we have placed not a presidium composed of secretaries of the union, but a very spicy photograph of Natasha Negoda from "Playboy." Let me remind you that not so long ago another Soviet actress suffered severe unpleasantness because she too appeared in this publication. Today, thank God, this phenomenon no longer shocks us and does not entail immediate sanctions. The Soviet film industry is actively attempting to break into the foreign market.

And now A. Konchalovskiy has decided to make his next film using the creator of the role of Rambo - Sylvester Stallone. They say that this will be hit of the season about police and gangsters.

And we have heard the phantasmogoric news about the fact that the director G. Yungvald-Khilkevich is working on a screen play of the biography of Pushkin, who will be played by Michael Jackson. This April Fool's joke was taken seriously by many. And this too was no accident.

[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA] Of course! Gorkiy's "Mother" is being imported here from Italy. "Dark Eyes" has already paraphrased Chekhov in the style of Mikhalkovskiy and Mastriani. And there are dozens, if not hundreds, of projects involving making Soviet films not for rubles, but dollars.

[D. Patmen, producer, Great Britain]. There are two possible ways to advance—the cultural and the commercial. It is important that you and your government think about which one is the most important.

The cultural route requires total support from the state. And this route can be defended. However, in a country where so much requires immediate allocation of resources, the sphere of culture is a sphere where disappointment may await you.

My advice to you is to concentrate your efforts on teaching a generation of filmmakers who will outlive our shortcomings and who will not be disturbed and stymied by the circumstances which stymie you.

You must create a generation of educated, subtle, multilingual film makers, who can capture the international audience.

[V. Dmitriyev, film expert, Moscow] One remark by Mr. Patmen surprised me somewhat. He considered the question of how our film can retain its honor having lost its virginity? Perhaps in America the retention of honor is associated with virginity, but I was brought up differently and I do not consider that the loss of virginity signifies the loss of honor!

The fact is that for many years we scrupulously and arduously preserved our ideological "film-virginity." We carefully demonstrated that we were completely independent, did not depend on anyone, that there was not and would never be any other cinematography like us in the world. Dozens of articles and speeches were devoted to this subject.. And now it becomes clear that, in preserving our "virginity," we lost something immeasurably greater—we lost the honor of the Soviet filmmaker. This is something that everyone must understand. And if we want to preserve this honor, then we must integrate ourselves into the international film world, and only through this can we recover our honor.

[K. Zakussi, film director, Poland] I sat on the jury of a certain festival where I viewed Soviet films with English subtitles. In the film "The Life of Klim Samgin," the hero asks his friend how he is to live. And in the English translation we read, "What should I do?" The question sound nonsensical, but the translation seems to me accurate. There are things which cannot be translated. And I am deeply convinced that all my colleagues who have succeeded in achieving serious success in the American and international marketplace have either moved far away from themselves, or have found within themselves a portion of their soul which corresponds with the American. You have a huge country, you have an audience sufficient for your internal market. But I think that you should look ahead, blaze a trail to the remainder of the world. Imitation of their style and thinking is impossible, but it is possible to conquer them if we truthfully and sincerely express our problems. We will astonish them with the truth and the audience will believe it.

"The Cranes are Flying" was a commercial success throughout the world. If there is inner power in a film, if there is spirit, then it will find its audience.

[O. Rudnev, chairman of "Sovexportfilm"] In the last few decades, interest and the number of showings of Soviet films abroad decreased by a factor of two or three.

In Czechoslovakia the percentage of the theater seats occupied at Soviet films was 12 percent. Every sixth screening was canceled because people do not buy tickets to Soviet films. Viet Nam has decreased the purchase of our films by a factor of two, interest in our films has fallen off sharply and in order to attract the viewers, they try pass off some of our films as products of the US. This was the case with the film "Ivanhoe," and the film "Secrets of Madam Vong."

If we speak of countries in the capitalist camp, then we have attained certain successes and I cannot help but feel pride in this.

But as for commercial rentals, sometimes not a single Soviet film is being shown commercially in the US.

[N. Mikhalkov, director, Moscow] We are speaking of the possibility of working with the West. But what kind of collaboration can there be when we are counting money in someone else's pocket and do not understand that until we develop respect for ourselves, no one else will ever respect us. These shameful *per diems*, this possibility of getting more only because someone has given something, this pettiness, this low level of human services, this inability to present ourselves as we are, a great state.. We are treated like a cheap labor force, and we consider ourselves a cheap labor force and allow ourselves to be treated thus. Because we think that if we resemble them they will love us. This is not true because people don't love those who resemble them, but those who have their own face, their own culture.

[E. Klimov, director, Moscow] Currently there is a dispute concerning how we are to reach the international screen, the international film marketplace, what to do so as to be accepted, understood, seen.

Nikita Mikhalkov and I have a longstanding dialogue or dispute. He is correct according to his own lights. He is wrong, it seems to me, in his belief that there is an imperative here—that we have to get there no matter what. And for this, it turns out, we have to become completely different. We have to transform ourselves. But do we really have to?

Perhaps the greatest difficulty today is that of finally becoming ourselves. And all that we tried to do here during these 3 years is an attempt to help us again become ourselves.

[T. Laddy, producer, USA] I think that if our American artfilms, which no matter what present certain difficulties for the audience, have so little success in the United States, then there is no point in maintaining the illusion that even your best films will have great commercial success. But, nevertheless, there is a market for them in the US; while not a big one, it is a market that is very important to the audiences that see them.

[A. German, director, Leningrad] I want to describe how they perceive and view our films in the West. My "Check-Point on the Road" was a success in Hollywood. The film experts watched it many times. And then the American directors came to me and said, "Oh, Aleksey! 'Check Point on the Road' is wonderful. It is marvelous when the machine gun heated from firing falls in the snow and hisses..." First one spoke of the machine gun, then a second, a third, and a fifth. I tried to figure out what was going on and concluded that the only thing interesting to the filmmakers was that machine gun falling in the snow and hissing. Why? Because filmmaking consists of 156 stunts: first the car goes through the boxes this way and then it goes that way. Then the hero is hit this way. And suddenly here comes a Soviet director who offers a picture where a machine gun falls in the snow and hisses. They had never done that. This was the source of my film's success.

[Kora Tsereteli, film expert, Georgia] Love and beauty will save humanity. But love and beauty are embodied in the constant, unfading, eternal form of mythology. Only if we make contact with those roots and deal with them, can we again put our art on a new path. Whether this will be done professionally on a commercial basis, or accomplished through the participation of pure art is another issue. But the appearance of Lelyusha's pictures about love or films of the type of "Cramer versus Cramer" is undoubtedly also a natural process of humanizing society, which must undergo purification from time to time.

[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA] We have come far short of quoting the ideas of all participants in the plenum. Many other positions and points of view were also expressed. But two tendencies, two views stood out clearly in the presentations. One is that we desperately need to break into the international film market, we need foreign exchange, imported film equipment and high quality film. And for this we must be totally integrated into the international film system, so as to occupy there the place of a leading film power.

The other point of view is that we must remain a completely independent, national film industry, which does not look around to see what anyone else is doing. We are proud of our glorious tradition and do not place a great deal of faith in the good intentions of Western film industries. In a word, we should go our own way.

And the truth, undoubtedly, as always, lies somewhere in between. We need both dollars and "Kodak" film and we do not want the Western viewer to reject us. But we will

be interesting to him and to ourselves only if we are, not a subsidiary of Hollywood, but an independent national, highly professional film industry, able to speak in our own vibrant and convincing language about our own problems, pain, and joys, and those which we share with all of humanity...

Thoughts have gotten ahead of deeds. This is natural, But it is just as natural that new ideas be embodied in real actions. The plenum is over. Now it is time for films.

### **Pornography Shows in Video Salons Proliferate**

18001032 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA  
in Russian 19 April 89 p 6

[Article by S. Yurakov: "Why is the Critical Problem under the 'Roofs' of Video Salons Not Being Resolved?"]

[Text] There is the bell for the next session. Those who are late rush to the screening room. Only a group of young people does not rush off. They are comfortably settles at the "video" in the foyer. The erotic show avidly involves its selected audience.

Very recently one could still see such a scene in the metropolitan Zaryadye Film Theater. The senior engineer of that hotbed of culture, Maksimov, officially wound the reel before the performance and then without a word amused the lovers of "sleaze." The fare for their satisfaction was five rubles. The police shortened this profitable business and Maksimov was held to be criminally responsible for disseminating pornography.

"Video" has come into our life in a powerful way. The population already has two million video tape players and in five years that many will be sold annually. The special viewer effect and the simplicity of circulating video products has aroused a lot of interest in "video." It has helped expand the horizons of information and there are new opportunities in teaching. Masterpieces of world cinematic art have become more accessible. At the same time video clips, westerns and "hits" occupy the leisure time of children, teenagers and adults.

What is alarming are the numerous letters to the editor: "porno" is flooding the video screens more and more and a stream of these films is pouring into this country illegally.

Last year the custom-house at Sheremetyevo II Airport alone took out of circulation more than 1500 video cassettes of films with ideologically harmful and pornographic contents. And we know the places where this pornographic contraband is sold.

USSR VNII [All-Union Scientific Research Institute] MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] Research worker A. Konishev has worked at the Moscow Criminal Investigation Department for the last ten years. He is the one who has specialized in combating video pornography and here is what he has to say:

I know from experience that "porn video" cripples unstable spirits. The first victim of sexual incitement is the teenager. We have researched criminal cases involving sexual crime and it turned out that there was spiritual corruption through the use of pornography in one out of every ten of these. And the result of interrogating youthful "victims" is that many of these girls began to become proficient in the oldest profession after looking at banned pictures. The statement by Tatar ASSR Minister of Internal Affairs S. Kirilov is noteworthy. He sees the recent emergence of erotic video films with elements of pornography as the reason for the increase in the incidence of rape committed by teenagers in the republic."

There are now five to seven thousand foreign films on the black market and many of them are of the erotic and pornographic persuasion. The self-interested offer entire lists of goods. Pure hucksters also market video cassettes priced from one-and-one-half rubles each. This brings enormous profits and according to the expert evaluation of specialists, the total fluctuates in the range of several hundred million rubles per year.

Various types of video clubs, video salons and video cafes are proliferating everywhere. "Video stops" are appearing in Houses of Culture and snackbars, in libraries and hotels, in stations and in parks. There is no reason to suspect all of them, but often pornographic films are also being shown under "cover" of official programs through individual bribes. Criminalists have many such examples.

"Porno" has bred many abscesses. And one usually wants to shout, "Where are the police looking?"

Konishev answers, "We look at the 'Geneva Convention on Suppressing the Circulation of Pornographic Items and Their Trade' Protocol and Article 228 of the RSFSR Criminal Code. It was previously thought to be "dead" and only since the early 60's have we seriously begun to work.

But some imperfections have been detected in the law. Officially, according to Article 228 of the RSFSR Criminal Code a husband can be held criminally responsible for disseminating pornography if he shows such a film to his own wife.

A. Konishev asserts, "But it would certainly be a simplification to reduce the problem to a lack of clarity in the law. We have instituted proceedings in 93 'video cases' in the last three years in Moscow, but more than half of them were halted as soon as they were started because of insufficient grounds. The fact is that investigators are

not always able to determine whether the video is pornographic. Therefore before starting criminal proceedings they have to turn to an expert for a preliminary evaluation of the film. From that point on everything is up in the air..."

As reality has shown, in almost every "video case" you still need serious expertise in addition to a preliminary evaluation. But there are still no standing committees covering such investigations, although there have long been committees for narcological, forensic medical and other experts. How could there not be one for this? And we must appeal to people who are considered competent. Therefore untrained people such as amateur photographers, instructors from the ideological departments of party raykoms and representatives from society often become experts. This means that the preliminary evaluation and the expertise itself are not always objective and reliable.

Erotica has spread throughout art. It has always been one of its basic motifs and has expressed the beauty of the feeling of love. Sanctimony in art is just as harmful as amorality. But erotica never transgresses the limits beyond which physiology begins. Yet it is very difficult to precisely determine these limits in art

What do we need to have this delicate expertise succeed? According to Konishev, what we need is a really competent and objective committee and participation of experts from various walks of life.

The time is certainly overdue to finally openly discuss these delicate problems. And we have to settle some organizational questions—to decide if there is to be expert standing committees and establish what experts may take part in them. And it is time for experts: we must gather art critics, lawyers, sex pathologists, psychiatrists and pedagogues at a "round table" and work out a concept of pornography and the methods for detecting its signs that is acceptable to us. And, according to criminologist, the USSR Ministry of Justice could be the initiator of such a "round table." For as long as there are arguments about "porno", "video sleaze" will poison thousand of souls.

#### **Regulations on Video Film Production Set Back Technology**

*18001346a Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA  
in Russian 29 Jun 89 p 4*

[Article by Candidate of Art Criticism Ya. Ioskevich and Candidate of Art Criticism V. Potemkin: "The 'Dawning of Video' Drags On"]

[Text] It is hard to imagine a public statement by an executive of any department who would not label the methods of prohibition as a creation of the times of the most "drastic stagnation."

Even an official letter from the leadership of USSR Goskino's Videofilm All-Union Production Association, published in SOVETSKAYA KULTURA on 28 March in a roundtable discussion titled "Competitors, Where Are You?", solemnly proclaims: "We feel that the video sphere should be regulated not by prohibitions but by legal and economic norms...." It is pleasant to hear such things. However, reading further: "...but in the evolved situation decisive measures were necessary, and moreover, they are as necessary today as they were before."

Decisive measures—that means mainly the USSR Council of Ministers 29 December decree "On Regulation of Certain Forms of Activity of Cooperatives," which prohibited some forms of cooperative activity, including filmmaking and video recording. As far as we know, Leningrad is the sole population center in the country that lives under the yoke of two rigid documents—the government decree named above, and the Lengorispolkom [Leningrad City Executive Committee] decision (No 977, 5 December 1988) "On Regulating Video Rentals." To restructure our lives, to put them in order is a sacred thing—no one argues with that. But when you encounter the imperative "prohibit," you can't help recalling M. Saltykov-Shchedrin's prophetic thought: "Every outrage has its own rules of propriety."

The Lengorispolkom's decision "On Regulating Video Rentals" echoes the mentioned text of Videofilm's leadership to a surprising degree. While it may assert in all manner of ways that "There cannot even be any discussion about any sort of monopoly in the sphere of video. Obviously, the sphere of video is fundamentally pluralistic, and it is precisely in this that the source of its development lies", experience shows that words and actions diverge. The noncompetitive state system of creating and renting video movies fears the competitive system of nonstate video studios, and especially rental of video movies, like it fears fire. Sellouts are a rarity in state video rental stores, while the trade union, Komsomol and former cooperative video rental stores, which were quick to find a "roof" for themselves in youth culture centers and clubs, are packed with people. The state video library is shamefully poor, and it is an especially saddening topic of discussion. According to extremely approximate estimates by specialists, there is a selection of several thousand different tapes in the nonstate video rental system. Perhaps the most popular cassette in Leningrad video libraries is the companion tape to the journal OGONEK, but even it, as we know, is made by a cooperative. We asked Lenkinovideo chief A. Vitol why there is a line for the companion tape to OGONEK when more copies could be made, and the line could be eliminated? The answer was this: This decision was the prerogative of Videofilm. Hundreds of cassettes never sought after by the public lie absolutely idle on the shelves, while at the same time they cannot be used to rerecord some popular program on, for example, Leningrad television. Is there any reason why the creative and commercial aspects of the matter shouldn't be turned over to A. Vitol, who is a highly experienced

filmmaker and a recipient of the RSFSR State Prize? Why shouldn't the chief of Lenkinovideoobyedineniye resolve issues concerning staffing, wages, and so on and so forth, which are resolved so simply by boys in any youth cinematographic center? Naturally in the conditions of the continually growing competitiveness and independence of organizations that offer an alternative to the state system, the state system is simply compelled to crush its rivals by bureaucratic means.

No, we will not rise to the defense of certain smart cooperative participants who make money under the "roofs" of youth cinematographic centers renting low-grade video trash, neglecting any concern for elementary sanitary and personal conditions. Some are concerned by the business side of video rentals, while others are concerned with the development of video culture. Some just "pump out" the money, while others—the video cooperative under the Institute of Theater, Music and Cinematography for example, which brings specialists together—create series of video lectures on problems of world motion picture and video culture, provide equipment support to the process of teaching students and graduate students, and publicize video culture through the "Znaniye" Society. Specialists who discussed the government decree and the Lengorispolkom's decision unanimously concluded that they are a serious blow primarily to the collectives that are seriously involved in the development of video culture.

The Lengorispolkom's decision was met with disbelief by the oblast trade union council and by the oblast all-union Komsomol committee, which possess their own legal documents on video rentals published by the AUCCTU and the All-Union Komsomol Central Committee. But as we know, a decision of local authorities must be fulfilled by all organizations on territory subordinated to these authorities, without exception. The prohibitions were imposed on Leningrad, but in Leningrad Oblast, things are the way they always were: The oblast executive committee is in no haste to follow the example of the Lengorispolkom. In the course of lengthy debates both the oblast trade union council and the oblast Komsomol committee agreed to register their video units with Lenkinovideo—not in person, but by correspondence, or formally, so as not to violate the decision. For several months two methodologists of Lenkinovideo failed to seriously assume their direct responsibilities, occupying themselves with registering video units. When will serious methodological work begin?

Ideally, we should have created a city methodological repertoire council on the problems of video, which might have been staffed by representatives of both state and nonstate video rental systems, and by scientists and specialists. The leaders of the nonstate video rental system declined to wait for a go-ahead, and in November of last year they created an interdepartmental city council under the Palace of Amateur Creativity. Here they study the repertoire and offer recommendations on



renting foreign films (for general audiences; for adults over 18 years old; for club functions accompanied by commentary from specialists; for selective viewing in lectures). Video studio executive training courses were recently opened. Rather than prohibiting here, they recommend, advise, persuade and teach. Lenkinovideo is not doing such work as yet.

It is our impression that the leadership of Lenkinovideo now clearly understands the disadvantageous creative and economic position it now occupies—in comparison with the nonstate video rental system, and that it cannot count on video film alone: The rate of development is too low. It is for the drowning to rescue themselves, as we know. We must give A. Vitol his due: He is making a rather active rescue effort. He reached agreement with the Elektrosila Production Association on allocating currency for acquisition of licenses for 200 foreign films, and the income from their rental would fill the cash registers of both enterprises. (For comparison: Videofilm possesses a little more than 200 selections). If other state video associations and trade union and Komsomol video stores also take this path, which is so promising from our point of view, in the very near future we may have a reasonably good fund (ideally an exchange fund) of video movies and programs, which will resolve the legal problem to a significant degree.

Participants of SOVETSKAYA KULTURA's round table were right: In the overwhelming majority of cases neither state nor trade union nor Komsomol video rental services can exclude Western commercial video production and still work profitably today. We would add to this that commercial films are not always bad, they are a different form of art, one which needs to be studied, one which requires comprehension. Regulations are one thing, but life is something else. Despite the prohibitions, "video piracy" is flourishing. And this situation is typical not only of our country. The turnover of "pirated" cassettes in Europe exceeds 50 percent of the total video turnover. And imposition of prohibitions is far from the best way of solving this problem. The negative results of this practice are already tangible in Leningrad. In the same way that prohibitory measures in the fight against drunkenness and alcoholism generated a destructive "moonshine effect," prohibition of "video piracy" generated an underground effect. Showings of many foreign films are once again being forced underground, which is making entrepreneurs rich; with such a "rental" system, both the art critics and the police are powerless. The video stores are ready to pay to rent foreign films and the programs of their authors through the VAAP, but this problem still remains unsolved. We repeat: Legal and economic problems must be solved by legal and economic methods, and not by prohibitions.

Video culture cannot be a matter of just one department today. World experience (the experience of countries in Western Europe, Hungary, Poland etc.) shows that decentralization of this activity is a natural and normal process. The restructuring of political and economic life

is also actively influencing development of video culture, which is becoming accessible to millions upon millions of people. Democratization of life has led to a flow of artistic information of a variety of ideological orientations that was unimaginable just a few years ago. And if we restrain the development of video culture artificially, we would hardly be able to carry out a unique sort of "general rehearsal" in the country before global television makes its appearance in the next few years, when private television sets could receive video programs from the most diverse countries by way of relay satellites. Under these conditions, state control, upon which excessive hopes had been laid some time in the past, will become absolutely impossible. In the sphere of video viewing, the educational function will be transferred more and more to the family and to the individual himself. As it were, we need to nurture the people's capability for reasonably selecting and critically evaluating the avalanche of information and creativity right now.

Are we preparing for all of this? More likely "no" than "yes." We do not have an adequate quantity of video equipment, and we are 15 years behind civilized countries. We have an extremely small number of specialists in video culture. We do not have any special and popular publications that would illuminate the problems of video culture and describe the movies arriving in the rental stores—state and nonstate, and their authors and actors. Our sociological service is still in an embryonic state.

No.... No.... No....

We have slept through the dawning of video in our country—that's quite true. Just so long as we don't doze through the video midday as well.

**New Film 'Our Father' Rewritten 21 Times**  
*18001346b Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA*  
*in Russian 29 Jun 89 p 4*

[Article by L. Moskovskaya: "Shooting of the Film 'Our Father'"]

[Excerpt] Director Boris Yermolayev is finishing the shooting of the film drama "Our Father" based on V. Katayev's story of the same name at the Mosfilm film studio in the Soyuz Association. Work on this picture began in 1964. In these years the director rewrote the script 21 times. The first version, you see, was written specially for the French actress Anouk Ami, who agreed to make the film, but....

V. Katayev wrote his story in 1946. It was based on real events that occurred in Odessa during the years of occupation. The story is about a woman and her young son wandering through the wintertime city, evading capture and assignment to a ghetto, and unable to find shelter anywhere.



Adopting the story's backdrop as their basis, the authors are not trying to translate it to the screen precisely: For the director, this is but an occasion for talking about life today. The exact time and place of the action are deliberately not indicated in the film.

"Our picture," B. Yermolayev emphasized, "is about spiritual emptiness, about the lack of communication between people, which may lead to a loss of the basic moral values; it is about the fact that membership to some particular nationality does not provide the grounds for antipathy and superiority.

[passage omitted]

### Historical Accuracy, Authenticity of Rybakov's New Novel Questioned

18001338 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA  
in Russian 1 Jul 89 p 4

[Article by Sergey Zavorotnyy, candidate of historical sciences: "History and a Novel: Concerning Certain Pages of Anatoliy Rybakov's New Book"]

[Text] Recently our thick and not-so-thick journals have been persistently carrying a story to the effect that one of our popular writers has apparently not avoided plagiarism. His name is even cited—it is Anatoliy Rybakov. The initial reaction to the material read was as follows: what has been found is a new and most likely an iniquitous trump-card in a polemic which, at times has gone beyond the bounds of the purely literary.

Anatoliy Rybakov surely must have quite a few enemies. Because, after all, it was he who, in essence, became the first widely known literary accuser of Stalin in our country. The novel "Children of the Arbat" created a great deal of noise. For a certain length of time Rybakov's book cast into the shade some anti-Stalinist novels which had been written even long before "Children of the Arbat."

We could argue about the literary merits of this novel. But one truth simply cannot be avoided—"Children of the Arbat" rocked the entire country, forcing, probably for the first time millions of Soviet citizens to think seriously about our society's still unhealed wound—Stalinism.

In order to defend the writer's good name, we had to conduct a journalistic investigation. It was a good thing that, in the present case, it was not necessary to take a business trip. All the materials could fit on one desk: Anatoliy Raybakov's novel "1935 and Other Years," which was published in the journal DRUZHBA NARODOV (No 9 and No 10, 198), and an item which is unknown to the Soviet reader—the reminiscences of Aleksandr Orlov, entitled "The Secret History of Stalin's Crimes." To be sure, in searching for the latter book, we had to rummage all over Moscow. This book has long

become a bibliographical rarity in the West. And in our country it had been securely hidden away in the special archives of the Lenin Library.

A few words about Aleksandr Orlov. We still know very little about him. We do know, from his own words, that he took part in the Civil War—he was in command of partisan detachments. After the Civil War he occupied important posts in the OGPU. In 1936 he became an advisor to Spain's Republican Government. In 1938 he fled to the West. As a witness he was dangerous—he knew too much about Stalin's crimes. For 14 years—right up until the Leader's own death—Orlov was hunted. But he survived. It was only after 1953 that he risked publishing his reminiscences about the terrible and sinister mechanism of the preparations for the Moscow trials which Stalin organized against the Leninist Old Guard....

I must confess that I really "gulped down" the novel "1935 and Other Years." But, to be frank, the places which I leafed through without reading were those devoted to the fates of Sasha, Varya, and about Ivan Parfenovich. I was looking for those pages where the writer revealed, in depth and in detail, the entire history of the first Moscow trial.

Where did he acquire such a stunning knowledge of all the closely guarded Stalinist intrigues? It became clear to me where he had gotten this information when I had finished reading Orlov's reminiscences. No matter how you turn it, one conclusion thrusts itself upon you—the novel "1935 and Other Years" stands on the shoulders of this book. The following objection might be made: what Orlov wrote constitutes merely the reminiscences of an eyewitness and nothing more. They are based on the bare facts, whereas Anatoliy Rybakov has written a novel. That's all correct: it would be ridiculous to scold a writer for using memoir-type literature. In the final analysis, Rybakov did not serve in the NKVD and does not know the Lublyanka's cuisine. That's the way I thought about this matter before reading through "The Secret History..." Alas, the whole trouble with the novel consists of the fact that, for Anatoliy Naumovich, Orlov's book literally served as a kind of desk-type glossary when he was writing "1935..."

Judge for yourselves. Here is how a face-to-face confrontation between Kamenev and Rayngold is described in Rybakov's novel.

"Liar!" said Kamenev. Reyngold replied as follows in a challenging tone of voice:

"It's you who are the liar, not me!"

"Precisely when were you at my place?"

"As I've clearly indicated, I was there several times in 1932, 1933, and 1934."

"In that case," Kamenev said, "be so kind as to tell us now, and in as much detail as possible, how the rooms are laid out in the apartment."

In Orlov's original the scene of this meeting appears as follows:

"Why are you lying?" Kamenev asked.

The NKVD is ascertaining who is lying: I or you!" Reyngold answered.

"You assert that you were in my apartment several times," Kamenev continued. "Could you tell us more precisely when this occurred?"

Reyngold listed 1932, 1933, and 1934.

"If you visited me so frequently, you, most likely, will be able to recall certain characteristic features of my apartment," and here Kamenev asked Reyngold several questions pertaining to the layout of the apartment....

And here is the meeting in the Kremlin between Stalin and Kamenev and Zinovyev, who have been brought there from prison. In Rybakov's novel Stalin remarks:

"We tell you again: submit to the party, and then your lives will be spared. You don't want to do that? Again you don't want to...."

In Orlov's book this same utterance by Stalin is recorded, in my opinion, more expressively, as follows:

"Even now you are told: submit yourselves to the will of the party—and you, along with all those whom you have dragged into the swamp—will have your lives spared. But again you don't want to listen or obey."

In order to be precise, let me list the pages of Rybakov's book in which Orlov's reminiscences simply "show through." They are pp 10-19, 27-31, 38-44, 50-51, 54-59, 69-74, 81-87, 99-103 of Issue No 10 of the journal DRUZHBA NARODOV. There are about 50 pages in all. It may be objected that the journal variant of this novel contains more than 200 pages. Let me note just one thing—the 50 pages I listed above do constitute the "hottest" ones, the unique "salt" of this novel. And what is quite significant is the fact that the Rybakov variant, in my view, is patently less effective than the original source. Granted, of course, Orlov is not a writer, he has, nevertheless, described in a very vital and rich manner all the dirt of the Moscow trials. Whatever you may say, he is a live eyewitness. Moreover, he does not lack a gift for literature....

I could be scolded as follows: what we need to do is not to criticize, but rather to pay homage to the resourcefulness of a writer who was able to bring, in such an original form, to the readers' purview entire chunks of this book which remains unpublished in our country and which

sharply exposes the crimes of Stalin and those persons who carried out his wishes. It seems that a certain ethical procedure was followed: this was not simply copied word for word. And a certain amount of hard currency was even saved: there is no longer any need to publish Orlov's reminiscences in our country. But, in another sense, it is unfortunate that Orlov's book was not simply cut up and republished; it is garbled in some respects. This was done, in my opinion, without any malicious intent, but rather for the sake of some effective pages.

What is it worth, for example, to have merely one scene in which Central Committee Secretary Yezhov unexpectedly enters the room of the investigator Sharok, who is grilling Reyngold—a key figure in the trial against Kamenev and Zinovyev? Upon checking this out, it would all seem to correspond to historical truth: Yezhov was, in fact, fond of making nocturnal "rounds" of the investigators' offices. And Reyngold was an important Soviet official. According to the novel, Reyngold's resistance was broken by a cunning trick—a counterfeit order for him to be shot. And the investigator Sharok reported this to the Central Committee secretary—well, why not have at least one "shining hour" in his career?! According to Orlov, everything was different. It was none other than Yezhov himself who advised having recourse to this trick. It was he, and not some middle-level operative, who played this game with Reyngold and who personally assured the latter that, in exchange for his false testimony at the trial, the party would not consider Reyngold guilty of anything. A petty detail? Hardly.

Deals with prominent Bolsheviks condemned at the first Moscow trial were concluded in the Kremlin, frequently in Stalin's office. It was none other than Stalin himself who was the main producer-director of the Moscow show trial. It was he who issued the directives as to how his victims should be treated, as well as what psychological, moral, and physical tortures should be used on them. Stalin was aided in this by Yagoda and Yezhov. As followers, they had their own tasks and did them, but they frequently were unable to "break up" the Leninist Old Guard. And this historical truth is also spoiled by Rybakov's pages.

In order to present a soul-pinching scene, Orlov's material concerning Ivan Nikitich Smirnov was cut out of the novel. That would be OK if he were a fictional character. But, after all, Smirnov was one of the oldest Bolsheviks. He knew Lenin well. And I think that Smirnov's relatives, if they were alive today, would find it difficult to read the rather rollickingly written scene of Ivan Nikitich's meeting with his former wife Safonova.

According to Rybakov's version, Smirnov behaved crudely and cursed his former wife, who had betrayed him. According to Orlov, everything was somewhat different: Smirnov agreed to provide the testimony which the investigators needed, but only under one condition—that his former, faithful companion not be implicated in the trial. He attempted to save her.

The story of "1935..." elucidates the following mournful truth: what we know about the bitter truth of Stalinism is still, to a great extent, from secondary sources. Orlov's book has been pulled apart and pilfered from. Trotsky's anti-Stalinist publications have been "plundered," and the reminiscences as well as books by Serzh and other witnesses to Stalinist crimes have been used. But these books were published in the West long ago.

People study our history by these books, rather than by Rybakov's novels. And not only these books. For various reasons, many valuable documents concerning the Stalinist period have remained in the archives of Western countries. Access to these materials is almost incredibly simple—just take them, read them, and study them thoroughly. But in our country up to the present time archival materials about our old disease are still kept under "seven seals" in the depths of the special archives. And so there remains only one thing for us—for the time being we must be satisfied with that thin, watery soup which our literary people can cook up for us. Everybody suffers from this—writers and readers, but most of all, access to the historical truth, from which we are increasingly being separated by the passing years. And if the decision to expose Stalin's crimes has been made, then we must proceed along this path to the end—to the archives.

Anatoliy Rybakov has made no secret of the fact that he is working on a continuation of his book "1935 and Other Years." It will deal with the trials of Pyatakov, Radek, Sokolnikov, Muralov, and other prominent leaders of the Bolshevik Party.

Well now, here too Orlov's book could do us a good service. With great clarity, detail, and a knowledge of the matter at hand he describes the entire dirty, highly secret preparations for this shameful show trial. I understand that the senior operative Sharok is to rise and make a career for himself. But I do not want the "Sharoks" to "break up" their victims, as in the case of Kamenev and Reyngold. I do not want it to come about that, because of the writer's wish, the truth about the second trial should come to the readers in his "literary processing."

The time for the entire truth about the Moscow trials is not too distant. And if we need anything at present, it is not preparation for experimental purposes, rewriting, or using with "good effect" the testimony of a witness who is little-known to us.

Orlov's memoirs still await serious analysis by specialists. It is up to historians to answer the question—to what degree can we rely on the testimony of an eyewitness (and perhaps co-participant in?) the Stalinist crimes? One thing is clear—it is still too early to accept unconditionally and on faith everything that this fugitive NKVD general has written. But, on the other hand, to ignore such a document as Orlov's memoirs would be unreasonable and unwise.

We would not like to scold our renowned writer again after the publication of his new novel. However, Anatoliy Naumovich himself once remarked that this is a matter which should "keep to its bed," but not on the shelf of a bookstore, but rather in a desk drawer. Its is difficult not to agree with this stance by the writer, since the "losses due to later publication are 'reimbursed' by the feeling which a writer experiences when he is writing in hopes of truthfully reflecting a complex and contradictory period in time." These words were also written by Rybakov. They are precise and to the point.

**From the editors.** In publishing the remarks by Sergey Zavorotnyy, candidate of historical sciences, they editors did not set as their principal goal a discussion of the writer Rybakov's creative methods. We consider and still do consider that Anatoliy Naumovich's works have made their own contribution to the cause of exposing Stalinism.

The noise from the first few articles and novels about the Cult of Personality has passed. Has our "unpredictable past" become clearer because of this? Probably the answer is yes. We have not yet achieved the main goal—the materials and documents of that period in time, the accounts by eyewitnesses, without which it is impossible to correctly understand the past....

**UkSSR Writers' Union Admonished for Lack of Glasnost, Restructuring**  
*18000786a Kiev RABOCHAYA GAZETA in Russian*  
*26 Feb 89 p 3*

[Article by Yu. Yachekin: "The Culture of Democracy. The Fuss: A Writer's Reflections"]

[Text] Lately talk has grown frequent that the Ukrainian Writers' Union may abolish itself as a single organization and be replaced by separate literary groupings. If you consider it, the issue is the destruction of the union and the legalization of "cliquing," a subject which for us has become a complete bore. I talked with many writers in an attempt to find out exactly what it is about our union that people do not like; what is it that has caused people to consider taking extreme measures?

It turns out that it is the union's greatly over-blown, cumbersome, clumsy and, most significant, elitist administrative mechanism, its self-isolation from writers, and its armchair style of management that elicit criticism. I even heard such things as: "Just as there used to be eternal students, now necessary to destroy the factories of an industrial association because the management has discovered its own administrative unsoundness? Accordingly, what is required is not destruction but a rational reorganization, which has in fact been necessary for a long time.

For example, in connection with the democratization of inter-nationality relations, the union needs a definite new structure, which would absorb into its sphere all the

problems of facilitating the development in the Ukraine of literary creativity in the languages of the peoples of the USSR, of the national minorities that live within the boundaries of the republic. After all, even the membership of the Ukrainian Writers' Union includes more than a few writers who write in Russian, Belorussian, Moldavian, Hungarian, Yiddish and other languages. We also have a strong detachment of translators, which, through its spirited labor, propagandizes in Ukrainian the best samples of the literatures of the USSR's fraternal peoples. I think it is time that the question of creating the position of secretary of a republic organization on questions of literary inter-nationality relations be carefully and thoroughly examined.

In addition, we should consider creating a corresponding publishing house, which would print both original works in the languages of the peoples of the USSR and translations of the best foreign-language compositions into Ukrainian. I think that the profitability of this kind of publishing house, dealing precisely with the best examples, would be guaranteed.

However, this is a matter for the future, although, I hope, for the very near future. But what is it that causes the greatest anxiety and criticism among writers now?

Above all, it is the obvious fact that the directors of the Kiev organization and the Ukrainian Writers' Union have completely removed themselves from resolving the vital and occasionally acute problems of our literary way of life. If the concept "literature" is mentioned, it is only in the titles of plenums and in meeting agendas, which quickly transform into unfinished premieres of the fable "The Cockoo and the Rooster," from the children's reader repertoire of "Grandfather Krylov."

Even the greatest strides of the restructuring in literature have bypassed the Ukrainian Writers' Union. In February of last year an extensive resolution by the USSR State Committee on Publishing came into force concerning the democratization of publishing and new norms for author-publisher interrelations. Have we discussed this document, which is of paramount importance for us, or the problems that have arisen with its appearance? No! Nor did LITERATURNA UKRAINA deem it necessary to give even a thorough statement of it. This being so, it is not surprising that many writers even now do not know about the broad rights they have been granted in creative interrelations with publishers.

This year all of the publishing houses switched over to a policy of economic accountability. Immediately many previously unknown problems arose in connection with inadequate experience in self-sufficient financial management. But if we ever talked about this, it was only among ourselves, and often without a deep, real understanding of the issue. From this arose many conflicting situations which might not have occurred. For example, publishing houses still practice the overcautious closed review, although it was abolished over a year ago by a

resolution of the USSR State Committee on Publishing. Because of this, none of the writers are insured against the use of non-objective criteria or, most humiliating, against the settling of old personal or clique scores by "silent" review. Or, here and there, through the use of secret pseudonyms, which are protected by the publishing house....

I could give still more examples of negative tendencies at the administration level of the Kiev organization and the Ukrainian Writers' Union. But what sense is there in this gloomy enumeration? After all, throughout the entire period of restructuring, we in the union have hotly debated the inadequacies that exist "somewhere," just not "here." We have ripped to pieces workers in all the social spheres, but we have solicitously and lovingly left the literary workers alone. You see, "somewhere" means administrators from other agencies; "here" means from ours!

In the bookstore repositories of Kiev a Himalayan range of remainders has accumulated. And the publishing house subject plans, graced with the names of officials of the literary elite, show the titles of books whose numerous previous editions have still not sold out. It happens that even interesting books pile up into mountain ranges, then go under the pulp knife. Why? Because, due to repeated publications in extremely large editions, the circulation of certain books supersaturated the book market long ago.

The secret, sectarian style of management which, despite restructuring in all areas of our lives, has been established in the offices of the Ukrainian Writers' Union, evokes acute dissatisfaction. It is enough to recall the disgraceful, one might say, significantly antidemocratic meeting of the Kiev writers' organization on the promotion of the candidates from the union to deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet. A "list from above" was announced—that was the entire "promotion." And neither of the self-promoted people present at the meeting—Yuri Mushketik and Ivan Drach—even considered it necessary to acquaint those attending with their programs.

A typically armchair result is the union "movement." After all, there was no preliminary discussion of the "movement's" documents at meetings of the editorial staffs of union journals, or in the Ukrainian Writers' Union publishing house "Radyanskyi pismennik," or in the literary associations and creative commissions of the Kiev organization. Unbelievable? But it is a fact! This is not a "movement," but the bustling of literature officials between offices and tribunals. The writers, in the name of whom all of this was being done, took no part in the fuss whatsoever, because they, in all seriousness, did not really know what it was all about.

And this is why the overwhelming majority of writers did not come to the meeting that was announced for January 31. As a matter of fact, you could call it an expanded session of the initiative group. Why then did they hold to it the entire Kiev organization of writers?

It is offensive that the newly elected party committee, too, has started down the deceitful road of secret decision-making. In the same way that the Kiev organization has neglected wide discussion of the "movement's" documents in the writers' subdivisions, the party committee has neglected to discuss them at meetings of the party organization. Will wonders never cease! Then who has taken the road to democratic reforms?...

And what would I say about the "movement's" program, if I were given ample opportunity to become acquainted with the project and to express my own opinion? Here is what I would say: The first thing that strikes me is that the program lacks a clearly defined, exact goal. And it is precisely with this—the determination of a goal—that all program documents begin, even those, religious documents included, that have come down to us from ancient times. And when there is no goal, or when it is formulated in a disorganized manner, unexpressively and amorphously, its substratum, its constructive concreteness, disappears.

It would be another matter if the informal new creation were called "The Movement for the Ecological Rebirth of the Ukraine." In this case, the goal would be directly indicated in the title itself, and the document would at once acquire conciseness and expressiveness, the lack of which writer Yuri Shcherbak has focused his attention on. I have no doubt that a movement for the ecological rebirth of the formerly picturesque Ukraine would receive truly universal support. And not only in our republic. Our projects would find understanding and, I think, would be taken up by the whole country.

These are the realities we have to deal with! It is not by chance that I, personally, have begun to feel a blind lack of faith in the sincerity of the intentions of our, so to speak, armchair restructurists. After all, if you examine the facts emotionlessly, the picture that appears will not be an entirely attractive one. It looks as if everything possible has done, besides someone actually raising a stink about himself and provoking a negative reaction, to skillfully cast slurs upon the processes of perestroika.

And this means again luring the writers' attention away from solving professional problems. What then will remain for the reader who grieves so for us, the writers?

Sadly, it is necessary to conclude that in the four years of restructuring, nothing in the Ukrainian Writers' Union apparatchiks' style of operating has changed. The hateful "line" suppressing criticism that the bosses find unpleasant has remained in force, the same as it was before. The newspaper LITERATURNIA UKRAINA, in violation of elementary journalistic ethics, "reacts" to every critical note from its readers with an opposing editorial rejoinder, and is not ashamed even to twist the facts and content of its readers' remarks.

Are you feeling down, reader?

Well, I will try to distract you with my fresh little, purely restructuring, aphorism: "All secrets are revealed only by secret ballot."

**Polish Culture Society Formed in Lvov**  
*18000786b Kiev RABOCHAYA GAZETA in Russian*  
*26 Feb 89 p 2*

[Article by V. Basiv: "The Running Day. A New Society"]

[Text] Lvov—This year, along with cultural societies for Ukrainians, Russians, Jews and Armenians, in Lvov a society for Polish culture has begun to operate. Its activities will facilitate the process of bringing representatives of the various nationalities that live in Galicia closer together.

The new organization will attempt to give the oblast's population access to Polish culture. Cells will be created regionally. The society has already organized a celebration of the anniversary of the birthday of Adam Mitskevich, and performances of the Central Model Orchestra of the Polish Armed Forces, well-known singer Andzhei Khiolskii, director Yuzef Radvan, and the People's Theater of Cracow. It is heartening that now Polish films will be shown in the Kopernik movie theater.

### **Kazakh Trade Union Plenum Seeks To Forestall Strikes**

18300693 Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA  
in Russian 14 May 89 p 2

[Article by M. Chirkov: "From the Plenum of the Kazakh Council of Trade Unions: Why Conflicts Arise"]

[Text] ...A shift of miners refused to come up to the surface from the tunnel. Foundry workers delivered an ultimatum to the administration of their factory and did not go to work. Previously we read about such cases only in reports from abroad, but now these things occur in our country and our republic. And this despite an appreciable broadening of the rights of the work collectives.

A plenum of the Kazakh Council of Trade Unions on 12 May was devoted to an analysis of these very new and complex phenomena in our life. Measures to eliminate the causes behind socioeconomic conflicts at enterprises and in organizations were discussed.

The report of E.M. Zhakselekov, chairman of the Kazakh Council of Trade Unions, and other speeches noted that even as perestroika is extended at the local level, dissatisfaction with its pace and practical results and a protest against diverse manifestations of authoritarian methods of leadership can be observed. Until some of the economic programs give an appropriate return, an imbalance in commodity-money relations will remain and the social sphere will only slowly catch up. All this promotes to a considerable degree the emergence of breeding grounds of tension in a number of work collectives.

Quite often they develop into refusals to work and other conflicts which have occurred this year at enterprises in metallurgy, motor transport, and other sectors.

Candidly and without any references at all to the "objective difficulties" so common in the recent past, the report and the speeches acknowledged that the trade union committees, the oblast soviets, and the Kazakh Council of Trade Unions itself have not distinguished themselves in these quite complicated and even extreme situations. In several places the trade union organizations have shown themselves by nature unprepared for such a turn of events, and in the majority of cases they were led along as usual by a negligent administration and did not demand an active investigation and the satisfaction of the fair and legal claims of the workers.

In many respects this failure to keep pace with life and with the high demands that perestroika makes of us is a result of the inability of the trade unions to work under the new conditions. And first of all this concerns the leaders at all levels.

In her speech N.V. Kuzmina, cargo inspector of the Kustanay station, gave the following example. The oblast leader visited them "for a meeting with the workers."

Only in quotation marks can what happened then be called a meeting. In the first place he began to treat everyone with unwarranted familiarity and to be rude. Referring to the station-master, he declared without any justification that he would not call the other by his first name and patronymic inasmuch as he did not respect him. In the second place he was unable to answer a single concrete question from the audience, and when someone made a remark to him about it, he behaved quite poorly. Doesn't this sort of "walk among the people" give rise to conflicts and result in a lack of understanding between leaders and subordinates?

If the situation is analyzed as a whole, conclusions such as these come to mind. The fundamental causes giving rise to conflicts in the work collectives most often are violations of the principle of social justice, unsatisfactory work and living conditions, a shortage of housing, the complex ecological situation in the regions, as well as poor economic preparation of the workers and their ignorance of the basic elements of economic accountability [khozaschet].

Passiveness and irresponsibility on the part of the managers and specialists of the enterprises contribute to the problem too. Quite often the worst sort of administration by injunction, rush jobs of all sorts, working and fits in starts, and late production work are substituted for the introduction of genuine economic accountability, self-financing, self-management, and the organization of general economic and legal education.

Some of those who spoke at the plenum themselves displayed an attachment to a bureaucratic style of leadership. In particular, reproaches were heard concerning those who work at individual labor activities; it was said that they "slow down" the work of the state enterprises. It was said, for instance, that all "contentious" workers must be fired. However it must be said that such appeals met with a rather emotional condemnation from the audience; and a rather well-reasoned condemnation from the rostrum of the plenum.

The issue was put this way: The trade union committees should only settle conflicts by legal means which should guarantee an impartial defense of both the workers' needs and society's interests. In view of this, numerous proposals on the need for a law to regulate socioeconomic conflicts were discussed.

However the main principle of trade union activity should boil down to the idea that it is easier to avert an illness than to heal it afterwards. And in this case, openness when working with people and the complete truth must serve as the "preventive measures." Speakers emphasized that the trade unions should not wait to seek out the reasons for their failures in the reports of the mass media. On the contrary, they should illuminate the problems of the day more and more clearly and point out the means of solving them, naturally without going to

extremes. The deepening processes of glasnost and democratization are the principal guarantors of positive change and the success of perestroika in its entirety.

M.S. Mendybayev, second secretary of the Kazakh CP Central Committee, spoke at the plenum.

The plenum also considered an organizational matter. A.I. Shchekota, chairman of the republic's committee of the agroindustrial complex workers trade union, was elected secretary and member of the Kazakh Council of Trade Unions Presidium.

**Prison Camp Labor Said to Be Economically Beneficial**

18001363 Moscow AGITATOR in Russian No 11  
Jun 89 p 17

[Letter to editor; unsigned response]

[Text] As we know, citizens convicted of crimes are engaged in labor at correctional institutions. But is their labor useful to society? Does society benefit from it? Or are they simply parasites?

[Signed] N.Vasilyeva, Penza.

Those who are sentenced by the courts to correctional labor are engaged in labor that benefits them as well as society. In particular, the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs is currently one of the largest producers of agricultural machinery and equipment. Over 140 specialized enterprises are engaged in the production of agricultural equipment; they produce 170 types of machinery, equipment and transport vehicles and around 1,000 types of spare parts for agricultural machinery, tractors, motor vehicles, etc. Some 11 percent of the total output of such equipment in the country is made by USSR MVD plants. In 1988 alone, they supplied the country's kolkhozes and sovkhoses with agricultural machinery worth a total of R900 million. If joint projects with plants of various industrial ministries were included, that sum would rise to R1.8 billion.

In the course of first 3 years of the current 5-year plan, the USSR MVD plants produced 140,000 tractor and truck trailers, over 7 million disc and chain harrows, 187,000 tractor couplings, 200,000 flat plows and cultivators, 100,000 mechanical loaders and 135,000 transporters for cattle farms.

Last year, jointly with the USSR Ministry of Agricultural Motor Vehicles, those plants manufactured 24 types of such vehicles worth R265,000. The vehicles are produced at 32 USSR MVD plants.

To make citizens engaged in correctional labor self-sufficient, the USSR MVD runs 47 large specialized agricultural enterprises and several hundred auxiliary

farms. During the past 3 years alone, the total area occupied by such farms rose by 120,000 hectares and now totals 617,600 hectares, of which 195,100 hectares are plowland.

Currently, auxiliary farms of the correctional systems produce 65.6 percent of all meat the system consumes. By 1995, those institutions are expected to cover all their needs using their own meat products.

So, it would be wrong to claim that labor in the USSR MVD system is purely symbolic and that it is not useful to society. While serving time, citizens are nevertheless engaged in productive labor.

Copyright: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Agitator", 1989.

**U.S.-USSR Anti-Crime Association Proposed**

18000951 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA  
in Russian 1 May 89 p 2

[Article by V. Ovchinskiy, deputy chief of the All-Union Scientific Research Institute Department of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs and candidate of juridical sciences, and R. Ekimyan, deputy chief of the Criminal Investigation Administration Department of the Main Administration of Internal Affairs of the Moscow Oblast Soviet Ispolkom: "Before It Is Too Late!"]

[Text] The Mafia, racketeering, drug-dealing, prostitution... Racketeering, prostitution, drug-dealing, the Mafia... For journalists this is all just an opportunity to write a sensational article. But for us, it is our daily work.

It is good that the press, television, and public opinion have begun to take an interest in our problems; although, of course, these are not just our problems, but everyone's. But, frankly speaking, in our daily professional activities we get little help and must grope our way along as before. And how else could it be? For decades it was believed that it was the fate of only Western special agencies to struggle with organized crime. Very often we used the strange term "Mafia" humorously, and we simply had not heard of racketeering. And this is the result—the trend developed freely, organized crime affected more and more new domains, until it reached right into the youth. And we, the professionals who occupy ourselves with this sphere of illegal activity, are compelled to grope along, to reinvent the wheel at a time when the United States has invaluable experience and has worked out concrete methods for the struggle against this dangerous evil.

There is still time! Organized crime in the USSR, we believe, is still only at the level of crime in the United States at the beginning of the sixties. Let us take this fact into consideration, let us, before it is too late, make use of the experience of others, and we will work together and learn.

In connection with this we address ourselves via the newspaper SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, which trains its sights on all the problems of our community, to the USSR Social Inventions Fund with the following initiative.

The essence of the initiative consists in creating a non-governmental, non-state, informal Soviet-American association, "Professional." It will be made up of professional detectives and researchers, working on problems of the struggle with organized and youth crime, drug abuse, and prostitution, as well as professionals from related fields—journalists, doctors, and sociologists.

Here again we state our grounds. Many negative trends in the USSR repeat in a number of ways analogous trends in the U.S. with regard to national, political, and historic specific features. Present circumstances require study of the above phenomena directly in the sub-units of the American criminal police force.

In connection with implementation of the Vienna accords the USSR has experienced a noticeable increase in departures of citizens to foreign destinations, including the United States. Among those departing are criminally-active elements trafficking in jewels, works of art, antiques, and drugs. Private citizens of the United States make similar visits here as well. This gives rise to the need for an exchange of information between criminal investigation bureaus.

The USSR is not a member of Interpol and other official international organizations leading the struggle against crime. And entry into such organizations is not foreseen in the near future. An exchange of information and methods of work can take place through unofficial channels within the framework of the project "Professional" with the help of sponsors, who will take upon themselves material costs, and of public funds.

And the main point. There is the concrete opportunity to learn how criminal investigation services may engage the assistance of public opinion.

#### **UkSSR Criminal Code Amended**

18000954 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian  
15 Apr 89 p 1

[Ukase of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium on the Introduction of Amendments and Supplements to the Criminal Code and Code of Criminal Procedures of the Ukrainian SSR, issued 14 April 1989]

[Text] In accordance with the 8 April 1989 Ukase of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium "On the Introduction of Amendments and Supplements to the USSR Law 'On Criminal Liability for State Crimes' and Several Other USSR Statutory Acts," and with the purpose of perfecting the legislation of the Ukrainian SSR, the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium resolves:

I. To introduce into the Ukrainian SSR Criminal Code the following amendments and supplements:

1. To set forth Articles 62 and 66 in the following wording:

"Article 62. Calls for the overthrow or modification of the Soviet state and social order

"Public calls for the overthrow of the Soviet state and social order or for its modification by means at variance with the USSR Constitution and the Ukrainian SSR Constitution, or for preventing the execution of Soviet laws with the purpose of subverting the political and economic system of the USSR, or in like manner, the manufacture with the purpose of dissemination or the dissemination of material of such content—

"will be punished by incarceration for a term of up to three years or a fine of up to 2,000 rubles.

"These same actions, perpetrated repeatedly or by an organized group of people, or with the use of technical means intended or adapted for mass circulation—

"will be punished by incarceration for a term of up to seven years or a fine of up to 5,000 rubles.

"Actions, specified in the first or second parts of the present article, which are perpetrated at the instruction of foreign organizations or their representatives, or with the use of material resources or technical means received from the indicated organizations—will be punished by incarceration for a term of from 3 to 10 years."

"Article 66. Violation of national and racial equality

"Intentional actions directed at the incitement of national or racial enmity or strife, or at the abasement of national honor and dignity, or in like manner, the direct or indirect restriction of rights, or the establishment of direct or indirect privileges for citizens dependent upon their racial or national origin—

"will be punished by incarceration for a term of up to three years or a fine of up to 2,000 rubles.

"These same actions, combined with coercion, deception, or threats, or in like manner, perpetrated by a public official—

"will be punished by incarceration for a term of up to five years or a fine of up to 5,000 rubles.

"Actions, specified in the first or second parts of the present article, which are perpetrated by a group of people or bring about the death of people or other grave consequences—

"will be punished by incarceration for a term of up to 10 years."



2. To supplement the Code with articles 62<sup>1</sup> and 66<sup>1</sup> of the following content:

"Article 62<sup>1</sup>. Calls for the perpetration of crimes against the state

"Public calls for high treason or for the perpetration of terrorist acts or acts of sabotage—

"will be punished by incarceration for a term of up to three years or a fine of up to 2,000 rubles."

"Article 66<sup>1</sup>. Disparagement or defamation of state organs and public organizations

"Public disparagement or defamation of higher organs of state power and administration of the USSR and Ukrainian SSR, or of other state organs established or elected by the USSR Congress of People's Deputies, the USSR Supreme Soviet, the Ukrainian SSR Congress of People's Deputies, or the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet, or of public officials designated, elected, or confirmed by the USSR Congress of People's Deputies, the USSR Supreme Soviet, the Ukrainian SSR Congress of People's Deputies, or the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet, or in like manner, of public organizations and their all-union and republic organs, created in a manner instituted by law and acting in accordance with the USSR Constitution—

"will be punished by incarceration for a term of up to three years or a fine of up to 2,000 rubles."

3. To supplement the second part of article 7<sup>1</sup> after the words "especially dangerous state crimes (articles 56-65)" with the words "violation of national and racial equality under aggravating circumstances (article 66 parts 2 and 3)."

4. To delete article 187<sup>1</sup> from the Code.

II. To introduce into the Ukrainian SSR Code of Criminal Procedures the following amendments and supplements:

1. In item 1 of article 34 to replace the figures "58-65" with the figures "58-62, 62<sup>1</sup>, 63-65," and in item 2 of that same article to replace the figures "66-68" with the figures "66, 66<sup>1</sup>, 67, 68"; and to delete from item 3 the figures "187<sup>1</sup>."

2. To supplement the first part of article 112 after the figures "66" with the figures "66<sup>1</sup>," and after the figures "55-62" with the figures "62<sup>1</sup>"; and to delete from that part the figures "187<sup>1</sup>."

[Signed] V. Shevchenko, chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

N. Khomenko, secretary of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

#### **UkSSR, MSSR MVD Official on Internal Troops Edict**

18110033 Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAYINA in Ukrainian  
20 Dec 88 p 4

[Interview with Lt Gen M. T. Aleksa, USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Internal Troops chief for the Ukrainian and Moldavian SSRs, by RADYANSKA UKRAYINA correspondent A. Tatarinov: "We Are Guarding Law and Order: Law Written for All"]

[Text] Our RADYANSKA UKRAYINA correspondent met with Lt Gen M. T. Aleksa, chief of USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Internal Troops for the Ukrainian and Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republics, to interview him in connection with USSR Supreme Soviet ratification of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium edict entitled "Rights and Duties of Internal Troops of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs on Maintaining Public Order," as well as asking him a number of other questions.

[Correspondent] Mykola Tymofiyovych, could you first tell our readers just what the Internal Troops are? Judging from the editors' mail, people don't know much about them. Many people have gotten the idea that since an edict on the rights and duties of the USSR MVD Internal Troops on maintaining public order was recently ratified at a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, this means that they were only recently established.

[Aleksa] Of course that is not the case. The Internal Troops are a component part of the USSR Armed Forces [effective 21 March 1989 they were formally detached from the USSR Armed Forces]. Their fighting history dates from 1918. Specifically what have been the activities of these troops over the last 70 years? Activities include participation in the Civil War, combating domestic enemies of the young Soviet State, guarding rail lines and waterways, industrial installations, etc. The following figures attest to how the officers and men of the Internal Troops fought during the Great Patriotic War: more than 200 members of our Internal Troops were named Hero of the Soviet Union, and dozens of units and subunits were awarded honorary name designations and awarded combat decorations, and 12 fighting men blocked enemy weapon position firing ports with their own bodies. Numerous memorials and commemorative tablets remind people of these heroic exploits.

Not only war but also today's peacetime life demands of military personnel boldness, staunchness, and firmness of character. Here is just one example. The Chernobyl disaster: Internal Security troops were the first to arrive in the disaster area. They gave a helping hand to the local population—handling the business of evacuation, guarding contaminated areas of terrain, citizens' property, and enterprises. Many primary-rank enlisted men, NCOs, warrant officers, and officers were awarded medals and decorations. And how about the events connected with

the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast and a number of other localities, where the organizers of unauthorized gatherings and mass meetings were counting on inflaming ethnic enmity and hostility toward agencies of government authority? Do you think it was easy to maintain order in such conditions?

[Correspondent] Is not this, Mykola Tymofiyovych, which is the reason for the recent edict?

[Aleksa] Not only that. Unquestionably the situation in which military personnel frequently find themselves, especially when hooligan elements incite public disturbances, demands a reliable guarantee of protection of the rights and lives of personnel. And we fully understand the concern on the part of parents whose children are serving with the Internal Troops. But still another, no less important factor was involved in the issuing of this edict. I would formulate it as follows: since there are people in our society who disregard the demands of socialist rule of law, the state must have at its disposal a powerful mechanism capable of countering any illegal actions. This edict of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet is directed precisely at this.

[Correspondent] As I gather from our conversation, however, in the past as well the Internal Troops have been involved in preserving public order and in performing other missions. What documents at that time specified their actions?

[Aleksa] These included legislative enactments, various government decrees, and ministerial orders. But they have also sometimes operated without explicitly-defined statutory rules of procedure. This is why there was need for a document which would place primary emphasis on legal protection of the individual and at the same time would provide a legal foundation for actions by the Internal Troops to prevent disturbances of public order which are of a mass nature and which constitute a threat to the lives and health of citizens, etc.

[Correspondent] Could you comment on some of the provisions of the edict?

[Aleksa] I would imagine that there is good reason for the interest being shown in the edict. To one degree or another it affects the interest of all Soviet citizens: they want to have a clear idea about guarantees of preserving of public order and their protection against actions by hooligan elements.

Some people, and I am talking about elements hostile to perestroika, have in fact been trying to discredit the edict, making reference to the explicit right to use weapons, the authority given to military personnel to enter homes and the premises of enterprises, organizations, and establishments in the pursuit of persons suspected of crimes as well as to put an end to criminal actions or violations of the law which threaten public order or the safety of individual citizens. But these

people say nothing about our duties and obligations, for this would obviously not be to their advantage. These people do not want to understand a certain truth or, stated more accurately, they ignore it: performance of one's duties and obligations is impossible without empowered rights.

Our troops serve the Soviet people. And this demands that military personnel, as stated in the edict, scrupulously adhere to socialist rule of law and that they be honest, truthful and brave, just and fair in dealing with citizens, that they courageously and selflessly defend citizens' personal dignity, constitutional rights and freedoms against criminal infringement and other antisocial acts. And these are not merely words. WO Pavel Kravtsov, for example, died a hero's death at his post as he challenged a criminal element. The same can be said about Sgt Vladimir Konyukh (subsequently discharged into the reserves). He, just like Pavel Kravtsov, although wounded by a hardened criminal, prevented the perpetrator from evading his just punishment. Vladimir Konyukh was awarded the Order of the Red Star for his selfless actions.

Or take the present day. The hearts of the men of the Internal Troops are filled with pain and sympathy in connection with the tragedy which has befallen the Armenian people. This is one of the reasons why they were among the first to give blood to help the victims, to collect money, and to proceed with clearing rubble. At the same time they are performing their principal mission—ensuring public order in the stricken areas.

I also want to address the question of using weapons. It is not easy to squeeze a trigger, even in conditions where immediate danger threatens your life or the life of a militiaman or a citizen and when other means are no longer effective or have been exhausted. This situation requires particular awareness of the correctness of one's extraordinary measures and an exceptionally high degree of self-discipline.

In addition, in any situation a soldier is guided by a feeling of duty, the highest sense of which is performance of the missions assigned to him by the state. Nevertheless the soldier as a rule, even when he finds himself in a hopeless situation, seeks a humane solution—to continue without bloodshed his duties pertaining to protecting citizens, imposing proper public order, and defending his own life. Employment of weapons constitutes for all intents and purposes a final resort in the effort to preserve the law and carry out one's orders. The Internal Troops, in addition to guarding government installations, special shipments, corrective labor facilities, and other tasks, assist internal affairs authorities in maintaining public order. Troops perform patrol and post duty in cities with special motorized militia units and, when necessary, with operational-designation units as well; they take part in maintaining public order during the holding of mass sociopolitical, sports and other events, quarantine procedures during epidemics and

epizootic outbreaks, as well as during fires and natural disasters; they take part in putting down disturbances of public order if they are of a mass nature and constitute a threat to the lives and health of citizens, disrupt the operations of enterprises, organizations and establishments, or are aimed at demolishing or destroying state, public, and personal property; they take measures aimed at quelling group insubordination and mass rioting by correctional institution inmates.

In connection with this, I would particularly like to draw your attention to the fact that involvement of troops in performing the missions enumerated above is done on the decision of the USSR Minister of Internal Affairs, and in certain cases with the consent and agreement of the USSR Council of Ministers.

[Correspondent] In such cases can Internal Troops units and subunits be placed under local authorities?

[Aleksa] Under no circumstances. I have heard it stated, for example, that such decisions allegedly place troops out of any control by local authorities. But at the very beginning of our interview I stressed that the Internal Troops are a component part of the Armed Forces. And pursuant to Article 73 of the USSR Constitution, direction of the Internal Troops falls within the jurisdiction of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. There are provisions to this effect in the USSR Armed Forces Manual of Garrison and Guard Duties, provisions which are formally articulated in the Edict of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Therefore everything is maintained within the framework of law. As regards local authorities, not only are they always informed of the missions being performed by Internal Troops in their area of jurisdiction but also themselves have a certain involvement in this.

[Correspondent] In addition to employment of weapons as an extraordinary measure, what other methods or means can the Internal Troops use in performing their assigned missions?

[Aleksa] In extraordinary instances they are authorized to use handcuffs or other means, as well as to employ special equipment [clubs, water cannon, tear gas, etc]. All this is specified by the USSR MVD in coordination with the USSR Ministry of Justice.

[Correspondent] Precisely in what kinds of situations?

[Aleksa] Handcuffs may be used to subdue and prevent disruptive conduct by detained individuals as well as during detaining and escort of dangerous criminals or criminals who have attempted to escape, while special equipment may be used to put an end to rioting or mass disturbances, disruption of public order by groups of individuals, as well as other antisocial actions. But I would like to emphasize once again that this is done only in exceptional instances.

[Correspondent] Mykola Tymofiyovych, you stated that the Internal Troops have their problems. What did you mean by that? Interrelations contrary to regulations, or other things?

[Aleksa] Unquestionably resolution of matters pertaining to further strengthening military discipline and eradication of ugly occurrences which diminish human dignity are a matter of particular concern to us, as they are for the Armed Forces as a whole. Unfortunately such things sometimes lead to tragic consequences. We devote a great deal of effort to this, although at times the results are not in our favor. I should like to take this opportunity to say something to those mass media which view the phenomenon of "dedovshchina" [hazing of recruits] as a phenomenon exclusively of the military. That is a lamentable error. No, we are not trying to dump our burdens onto the shoulders of others, but we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that some conscripts are already infected by cruelty before they come to us. I believe that this problem must be resolved by society as a whole. And the sooner everybody realizes this fact, the more effective our efforts to strengthen military discipline and order will be.

[Correspondent] Thank you for the interview. On behalf of our readers I wish success to you and to Internal Troops personnel in carrying out their military duty and in further democratization of military affairs.

**Internal Affairs Official on Soviet  
Counternarcotics Trends, Trafficking**  
53001011 Moscow ZA RUBEZHOM in Russian  
No 26, 23-29 Jun 89 p 11

[Interview with Maj Gen of the Militia Aleksandr Mikhaylovich Kotlyarov, deputy chief of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Criminal Investigation Main Administration, by ZA RUBEZHOM editorial staff: "How To Overcome the Criminal Evil?"]

[Text] *The struggle against narcotics production and trafficking cannot be effective without international cooperation. Lately, the Soviet Union has also become more closely involved in this cooperation. This certainly is beneficial for our country. You see, drug addiction and the resulting crime are increasing in our country. The editorial board of ZA RUBEZHOM asked Maj Gen Militia Aleksandr Mikhaylovich Kotlyarov, deputy chief of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Investigation Main Administration, to answer a number of questions concerning this problem.*

[ZA RUBEZHOM] Tell us, how critical is the problem of illegal drug traffic into the USSR? What is being done to strengthen international cooperation in the struggle against drug trafficking?

[Kotlyarov] So far, illegal drug traffic is not widespread in the Soviet Union. Only isolated cases of importing drugs into the USSR and their transit through our

country have been recorded. However, we are not standing on the sidelines in the international struggle against drug addiction and drug trafficking as a problem common to all mankind.

In recent years, the Soviet Union has taken a number of steps that are fundamentally new for our foreign policy. Among them: joining the UN fund for fighting drug abuse in 1987; voting for the first time in many years at the UN General Assembly to increase financial appropriations for the activities of UN agencies for controlling drugs.

The USSR supports using the "method of controlled deliveries" in the fight against illegal drug trafficking. Broader use of this method is called for in the new Convention on Fighting Drugs. And it must be said that this work has practical results. About 10 tons of hashish passing through our country have been seized. Our customs service and Canadian colleagues jointly carried out measures to seize 1.5 tons of hashish and exposed an international ring of drug dealers.

Within the framework of an agreement signed between the USSR and Great Britain on cooperation in fighting illegal drugs, a joint operation was carried out in the spring of last year to confiscate 3.5 tons of hashish valued at 10 million pounds sterling.

We held a working meeting with delegations from the ministries of internal affairs of Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland and Czechoslovakia, shared opinions, and discussed joint measures for intensifying the struggle against drug addiction.

We are expanding cooperation with capitalist countries. An inter-governmental agreement has been concluded with the United States, which we are working on implementing now. It calls for:

- exchanging information on individuals engaging in illegal transportation and sale of drugs, and conducting joint measures to expose them;
- exchanging genuine samples of drugs for conducting research;
- training in the law-enforcement area, including participation of Soviet specialists in U.S. programs; and a number of other steps.

Representatives of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs participated in an international seminar held in the Hungarian People's Republic on organizing the fight against illegal drug trafficking. The U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) organized the seminar. The seminar provided much that was useful in terms of expanding the outlook and professional knowledge, studying positive experience, and establishing personal contacts.

It is now becoming obvious that the constantly expanding economic and cultural ties, development of tourism, and institution of simplified exit and entrance procedures also will entail certain side consequences. It must be assumed that criminals, taking advantage of these circumstances, also will look for an opportunity to establish ties abroad.

Therefore, we believe that further expansion of international cooperation in the fight against illegal drug trafficking is an essential condition for successful resolution of this problem.

[ZA RUBEZHOM] Could you cite some data characterizing the situation with drug addiction in the Soviet Union? In what regions is it widespread?

[Kotlyarov] Today, the country as a whole has recorded more than 124,000 drug users, 70,000 of whom are considered drug addicts. A trend toward "rejuvenation" of this phenomenon is being observed. According to statistical data, almost two-thirds of the individuals abusing drugs are under age 30.

I cannot help but note the high latency of drug addiction; therefore, the statistics I cited do not fully reflect the real picture of the spreading of this phenomenon. According to some expert estimates, the number of drug users in the USSR may be 5-6 times as high.

Drugs that come from plants are prevalent in illegal drug trade (opium, hashish, koknar). They are made from the opium and oil-bearing poppy and various varieties of hemp. Lately, in connection with the stepped up efforts to eliminate the raw material base of drugs, there has been a noted increase in medicinal drug addiction. New types of narcotics are appearing that are made from drugs that are not narcotics, and also from various chemical substances and reagents.

Today it is hard to find a region in the Soviet Union that does not have drug addicts and has not recorded crimes associated with drugs.

Drug addiction is most widespread in regions possessing a significant raw material base (Central Asia, Kazakhstan, North Caucasus, Ukraine, Far East), and also in large cities and industrial centers.

[ZA RUBEZHOM] Along what basic directions is the struggle against drug addiction being waged, and what problems are you encountering in your activities?

[Kotlyarov] We view drug addiction as a social evil that must be opposed, as we say, by the "entire world." Success here is possible only if a complex of radical measures are implemented to strengthen the family, educate young people, improve leisure time and living conditions, enhance the culture and social activeness of the population, and firmly establish on this basis a

healthy way of life. It is understandable that much in resolving these issues goes beyond the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Internal Affairs.

The militia carries out only a portion of the tasks to put an end to the spread of this ugly phenomenon. One of the main directions of our activities is identification and reporting of drug abusers and preventive work with them. In our opinion, much depends on its effectiveness. You see, only by having a true picture can we correctly predict the situation, determine necessary measures, ensure the effective placement of forces and resources, and achieve positive results in the final analysis.

It must be said that positive changes have been noted. Our cooperation with health agencies in identifying and treating drug addicts is improving. Individual educational work with them has become more effective. We carry out this work together with labor and pedagogical collectives and the Komsomol, and we are getting the public involved in it.

An equally important direction is the work to cut off avenues and sources of illegal drugs. This involves a complex of measures for combating the illegal planting of narcotic-bearing plants, destroying wild hemp, and ensuring proper conditions for the manufacture, storage, and use of narcotic and dangerous substances at health institutions and pharmaceutical enterprises. I would add to this increasing protection of state plantings of hemp, putting an end to attempts to export drugs and raw materials from regions possessing a raw material base to large cities and industrial centers, and a number of other measures.

The "black market" prices of drugs can serve as a distinctive indicator, a sort of "rule of contraries," of the effectiveness of the steps being taken: In the last 3 years, they have increased 5- to 10-fold.

The existing demand for drugs makes illegal drug pushing a profitable business. Hence the attempts to get more and more people involved in using drugs. Therefore, we see our main task to be fighting the various categories of drug distributors (sellers, embezzlers, organizers and operators of drug houses, and individuals getting other citizens involved in drug addiction). This work is being carried out by operation and investigation methods provided by law.

In the last 2 years alone, internal affairs agencies have detected more than 15,000 crimes associated with drug addiction, taken legal action against about 6,000 sellers and embezzlers of narcotics, and seized 7.6 tons of drugs and 48.8 tons of raw materials (hemp leaves and stalks, poppy plants) from illegal circulation.

On the whole, we are far from being exuberant in the work. There are many shortcomings and unresolved problems.

We have not yet gotten rid of the formal approach to the matter. Individual leaders underestimate the social danger of the spread of drug addiction. Not wishing to assume an extra "burden" and pursuing "successful" statistics, they are afraid to show the problem without embellishment, and that means they are not taking the necessary steps to combat drugs and, to put it bluntly, are doing nothing.

The issues of fighting drug addiction affect many ministries and departments to a varying degree. Unfortunately, their actions are often not coordinated. There is no unified plan for these actions, and specific tasks and ways of carrying them out have not been determined. In my opinion, there is an urgent need to create a single agency that would determine policy in this area and ensure coordination of efforts of the ministries and public organizations concerned. There must be a specific demand for end results in activities. Using the experience of other countries, we should develop a state program to fight drug addiction, give each department specific tasks, and allocate funds for the various directions of activities in this sphere.

Existing legislation must also be improved. Take, for example, illegal dealing in narcotic preparations. A medical worker stealing one vial of narcotics sells it for 10-20 rubles (depending on its type and the region), but compensates for the damage at retail prices, from 3 to 10 kopecks per vial. We must make theft economically unprofitable, forcing payment of damages in an amount many times over. It is necessary to strengthen the special subunits fighting illegal drug trafficking and equip them with the necessary scientific and technical means. The list of measures being proposed can go on and on.

[ZA RUBEZHOM] Does an organized underground drug business exist in our country?

[Kotlyarov] I have no grounds to say there is a well-organized underground drug business in the USSR, especially on the scale that it exists in a number of other countries. The point is, most likely, we have virtually no "hard" drugs (heroin, LSD, cocaine, "crack," and the like) in illegal traffic. You see, their production requires the appropriate equipment, the involvement of specialists, the acquisition of various chemical substances for obtaining a pure narcotic, and, consequently, the creation of a certain organizational structure—beginning from obtaining the raw materials and ending with the sale of the finished product.

In the USSR, as I have already noted, drug addicts use mainly opium, hashish, and koknar; the "technology" for obtaining these is quite simple. Therefore, a considerable portion of the drug addicts manufacture medicinal herbs on their own, without resorting to pushers. Or they themselves are pushers, selling the drugs to other like themselves.

But, certainly, there are criminals who specialize in drug trafficking. An analysis of criminal cases investigated shows that small groups (usually 3-5 persons) with clearly assigned roles are created by them for this purpose. The organizer, as a rule, just finances the "deal" and plans the operations for manufacturing or acquiring the drugs and their subsequent sale. A total of about 3,000 crimes involving the group sale of drugs were brought to light in the last 2 years.

[ZA RUBEZHOM] Is there a causal link between drug addiction and the increase in crime in the country?

[Kotlyarov] Yes, without a doubt, this link can be traced. One of the aspects of the social danger of drug addiction is that it is a significant crime-generating factor which contributes to the commitment of various, often grave, crimes. Drug addicts objectively and subjectively have a greater tendency to commit crimes. First of all, the drugs are acquired by criminal means. Secondly, the existing demand for drugs also gives rise to the corresponding supply, the source of which is also some or other criminal activity. Thirdly, the enormous prices for drugs and, consequently, the need for the "slaves" of this poison to spend considerable amounts of money to obtain them push the drug addicts to commit various property crimes. In individual regions of the country, 60-70 percent of the thefts of state and public property and personal property of citizens are committed by drug addicts. Fourthly, drug abusers themselves often become victims of crime.

All these circumstances also determine the influence of drug addiction on the state of crime in our country.

### **New Belorussian Komsomol Department to Study Youth Problems**

18000961 Minsk ZNAMYA YUNOSTI in Russian  
23 Mar 89 p 1

[Interview with Department Manager A. Danilov by BELTA correspondent: "Reestablish Reciprocal Ties"]

[Text] The new structure of the Belorussian Komsomol Central Committee now has a Department for Researching Youth Problems. Correspondent Belta asked department manager Aleksandr Danilov to tell us about the department's work, goals and missions.

[Danilov] One of the priority directions of our activities is the study of social opinion. For many years we have worked practically "blindly," at times not even knowing or simply not considering the interests of young people. But we simply must have effective information on specific events and must know how Komsomol members relate to them. In knowing how to use a situation, it will naturally be much easier for administrative employees to make the correct decisions. We have already made our initial attempt. We have already polled a thousand young people from all walks of life in Minsk and have

attempted to determine the most urgent problems disturbing them. The next public opinion poll is planned for after the May elections. In addition to analyzing specific events, our department plans to get involved in promising research into the most urgent problems and prepare surveys of youth press. We want to set up a sociologist column in newspapers for young people. This column will reflect the results of our research. In addition to this, the department plans to publish a public opinion bulletin six times per year.

[Correspondent] You will essentially be involved in sociological research. Does the department have specialists able to do this work at the necessary level?

[Danilov] We do not intend to invent the bicycle. Belorussia and Minsk in particular have sociological centers and groups with which the department has developed close ties. The formerly "unpopular" sociology is experiencing its revival. There is still a shortage of cadre, but this year BGU [Belorussian State University] imeni V. I. Lenin is opening a sociology department in which the first twenty-five people will study. But then we are not starting from scratch. As far back as 1984 a council for sociological research was established in the Komsomol Central Committee and we were able to bring in many famous experts. This beginning was successful. Our plenums began using materials by these sociologists, and certainly not for the first time, but... at that time many people treated this materials like numbers in reports and nothing more. But today we have established contact with BGU's PNILSI [not further expanded] and with the BSSR Academy of Sciences sociological center and are relying on their assistance. A valid question is—how will the Department for Researching Youth Problems be able to process and store this enormous volume of information and how will it be utilized? The Komsomol Central Committee has acquired several personal computers and one of them has been given to us.

[Correspondent] But your department was established to do more than process and store material. How have you planned to use it in a practical sense, or will it remain for internal-departmental use?

[Danilov] Publishing activities hold a special place in the department's work. We want to continue the series "Dialog s Molodezhyu" [Dialogue with Young People] and publish a third book. Perhaps the most difficult task we have to complete is returning history to the Komsomol. We have already set up a working group that is involved in preparing documents from the first 14 congresses, material that has as yet never been published. We are also now gathering a collective of authors to prepare documentary-commentary material. I want to stress that this will not be a re-publication of the famous essays that were printed in 1975, but rather a new view of the history of the Belorussian Komsomol.

[Correspondent] Will the department get involved in studying our own internal republic problems?

[Danilov] That is exactly what I wanted to talk about. We have gotten to the third aspect of our work. We have developed a lot of problems within the Komsomol. We have to understand the goals and tasks of the union and the Komsomol's place and role in the political system, in the country's youth movement and in its interrelations with party committees and other social organizations. We also have to examine the relationship between Komsomol political and economic activities. These issues demand serious study.

[Correspondent] What is the department's planned coefficient of useful activity? As I understand it, you are assigning first priority to studying problems and producing recommendations?

[Danilov] First, and this is important, the Komsomol will be able to be revived if it begins to reflect the interests of young people. And for this to happen, as a minimum we have to know those interests. Therefore we have to reestablish reciprocal communications. For example, we have stereotypically considered narcotic addiction, alcoholism and prostitution to be the most painful problems in the youthful milieu. But today, and this is confirmed by recent polls, such problems as social justice, the ecology and protecting the rights of young people are no less painful. Second, our main task is not simply to study the situation and issue recommendations, but to follow up to see how effectively the work to change the situation is being done. There are many problems and all of them are inter-related, so we must not conduct local campaigns. What we need is a well thought-out program that envisions not only amassing information and simply disseminating the best experiments, but also constantly analyzing and searching for new solutions. These are the primary methods for the department's work in researching the problems of young people.

**Future of Georgian Komsomol Outlined**  
*18001175 Tbilisi MOLODEZH GRUZII in Russian*  
*18 May 89 p 2*

[Unsigned article: "Changing Not Only the Form, But the Essence"]

[Text] The Georgian Komsomol Central Committee has opened a discussion club. Anyone with any concerns about the future of the republic Komsomol is welcome to go there between three and five in the afternoon every day. Some Komsomol organizations have already conveyed their thoughts to the club.

Today we suggest that you acquaint yourselves with the basic features of a new draft charter and program for the republic Komsomol, drawn up by an action group of Saburtalinskiy Rayon Komsomol members and adopted at a meeting of the rayon Komsomol active membership.

Today we think it superfluous to state that the republic Komsomol - and, indeed, the entire Komsomol in general - is going through a profound crisis. For various objective and subjective reasons, the number of those who, overtly or covertly, actively or passively, oppose the Komsomol has grown. The Georgian Komsomol as a political organization has become so diluted in the mass of young people, has lost so much of its essence, its content and form that it is today simply impossible to describe it as the defender and bearer of youthful ideas. This organization is perceptibly falling behind the tempo of social development, has separated itself from the majority of young people, and has abandoned the vanguard positions of leadership which, one must acknowledge, it had never gained on its own account. The Komsomol, being by now accustomed to the Party's patronage and enjoying a political monopoly over youth initiatives, has turned into a spineless agent of the will of the Party and of the All-Union Komsomol organization. It mechanically repeated the serious mistakes made by the Party throughout that entire period. So now the Georgian Komsomol is without a clear-cut program based upon the interests of the republic's young people, the functions appropriated by the organization within the structure of the political system have been eroded, sham-patriotic and mock-internationalist sentiments are being disseminated and the unique features and traditions of the people negated. In its repudiation of political, educative and economic activity, the Georgian Komsomol has, to all intents and purposes, become a mere coordinator of young people's leisure activities.

We hold that the time has come for the Komsomol to reject the idea under which it represents an entire generation of young people. It should not be suspicious of diverse progressively-minded youth groups and informal organizations. The Komsomol should have the courage and good sense to exercise its constitutional right by approaching the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Georgian SSR to propose that a new law on volunteer youth societies be enacted. The Komsomol should take it upon itself to resolve the issue of creating a youth parliament based on youth organizations. All youth associations, groups, unions and organizations would be on an equal footing with the Komsomol in such a parliament.

The Komsomol will achieve this goal only if it effects a radical change in the content and essence of its work. The history of the republic Komsomol and its present standing give us good reason to assert that unless the Komsomol organization changes its bearings and restructures the forms and methods of its work, it will never emerge from this crisis.

This being so, we consider it essential to draw up a new program and charter for the Georgian Komsomol. As an independent youth organization, the republic Komsomol should apply every effort to resolve issues connected

with the achievement of political, economic, and cultural sovereignty, the creation of a just state, the enhancement of the people's wellbeing, and the development of democratic society.

The Georgian Komsomol, which will share a common platform with the republic Communist Party, should stand opposed to all conservative forces in the government apparatus and social organizations.

The Georgian Komsomol's membership of the All-Union Komsomol Organization can only be on terms of equality. And decrees adopted by the latter will be taken as no more than suggestions.

The Georgian Komsomol should establish contact with the church, and in concert with it campaign for peace and for the moral and ethical principles of existence; it should promote the ideals of humanism. It should wage an active struggle to resolve ecological and demographic problems. It should solve the issue of young Georgian males performing their compulsory military service in the Transcaucasus, and should further the legitimization of Georgian citizen status.

The Georgian Komsomol should establish direct contact with all progressive youth organizations, both in other republics and outside the country. It should concern itself with the creation of its own foreign-currency fund.

Though time will be needed to surmount this crisis, we are profoundly convinced that procrastination and mere cosmetic modifications are no way out of this situation.

A youth movement that has developed in a spontaneous manner will not find the Komsomol an interesting or worthy opponent and will definitively reject it. This, in our view, will be a major error in the plan for the continuation of the nationality movement and the achievement of practical results thereby.

**Komsomol Scientific-Research Center Director on Youth's Societal, Political Standing**  
*18001331 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA*  
*in Russian 12 Jul 89 p 10*

[Interview with Professor Igor Mikhaylovich Ilinskiy, director of the All-Union Komsomol Central Committee Scientific-Research Center, conducted by Yu. Poroykov, LITERATURNAYA GAZETA deputy editor-in-chief: "The Paths Are Open. Where Do They Lead?"]

[Text] Professor I. Ilinskiy, director of the All-Union Komsomol Central Committee Scientific-Research Center and doctor of philosophical sciences, and Yu. Poroykov, LITERATURNAYA GAZETA deputy editor-in-chief, discuss the standing of young people in society and their present status in political life.

[Poroykov] Igor Mikhaylovich, you and I worked in the Komsomol for many years, in various positions and in various areas. I have long since moved into a different field, yet you are still working on Komsomol problems. Therefore right at the start I would like to put it to you bluntly: do you recall how at the Congress of People's Deputies members of the older generation literally stood in line, jostling one another, to get to the microphone so they could talk about their urgent problems? But I did not see anyone from the Komsomol, any young people, in that line. Why not? Were they obedient, disciplined and trained in the best traditions of parliamentary debate? Or merely timid and unprepared for serious discussion?

[Ilinskiy] I do not think that was the case. The group of Komsomol deputies came to the congress with its own program, which was published in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA. Incidentally, our center is also directly involved with that program. The idea of a comprehensive youth policy, the draft Law on Youth, the establishment of a Youth Affairs Committee under the Supreme Soviet... So far as I know these proposals received the support of the Komsomol membership; our young deputies did have something to say from the podium, something to fight for. As for why they were not eager to do so... Obviously the reason for that was the unaccustomed atmosphere at the deputies' forum. General political discussion gripped those assembled to such an extent that our inexperienced young members of parliament with their own problems were pushed aside.

[Poroykov] So young people found themselves facing a situation of something like discrimination?

[Ilinskiy] Not at the congress, but in everyday life today there is clearly discrimination against young people. Judge for yourself. A young worker's average pay is 120-140 rubles per month. The average annual income of a student receiving a stipend is less than 500 rubles. Approximately four million young families are on the waiting list for housing in our country, and 1.5 million young families are waiting for space in kindergartens and nurseries. Only 10 percent of working young people have individual apartments; two-thirds of young people under the age of 27 are either living in dormitories or renting housing privately. It is not surprising that some young people are feeling a growing sense of discomfort and loss.

[Poroykov] Generally speaking, has anyone ever attempted to compile a list of young people's problems, a sort of roster of injuries and insults?

[Ilinskiy] Never, unfortunately. This task has never been posed, at least not to our scientific community. According to UNESCO data 131 countries assess the status and social self-perception of children on an annual basis (incidentally, we are in 39th place in this regard!). As for young people... Recently I met with the director of



UNESCO's Youth Problems Department, a Mr. Valiani, in Moscow. "Nothing," he said. "When we push the button on the computer labelled 'Soviet youth' we get nothing..."

[Poroykov] What does that mean?

[Ilinskiy] Well, it is not hard to guess. Above all, it means that we live in a world of myths and illusions about our young people as a privileged class. We have convinced one another that we have no problems with young people, that they are faithful to the ideals of their forefathers, that there never has been nor can there ever be any conflict between generations. That was our central idea! All social scientists' efforts were based on it.

[Poroykov] Essentially we consciously cut ourselves off from the whole world, proud of our uniqueness, saying: we have no problems with young people, nor can we ever have them.

[Ilinskiy] In the early 1930's Stalin met with Colonel Robins and discussed various matters with him, including young people. Robins asked Stalin how he assessed the situation of children and young people. Stalin replied that without a doubt our young people were the happiest and most fortunate. However, soon after that the death penalty for children as young as 12 years old was introduced in our country. Yet the myth persists. And we have inherited this stereotype. Not long after a song was written: "...we live under a golden sun... We are proud of our Fatherland... All paths are open to the young..." Those are Stalin's words: "all paths are open."

But we are talking about the causes, whereas you asked about problems. Of course we should have a roster of these problems. I have here with me a report entitled "Young People in the USSR, An Informational and Analytical Report: On Young People's Standing in Society and Their Most Pressing Problems." This contains our proposals to the party Central Committee, to the USSR Supreme Soviet's Youth Affairs Committee [sic] and, of course, to the All-Union Komsomol Central Committee.

[Poroykov] And what are your conclusions?

[Ilinskiy] Our general conclusions are as follows: during the years when the myth of happy young people prevailed changes occurred in the "youth-society" relationship, changes on both sides. The most striking example of that was shock Komsomol construction work in which young people really did perform miracles of heroism, responsiveness and self-sacrifice, while to economic administrators and the state they represented nothing more than a source of cheap, mobile labor resources.

In regard to the political arena... Here we find a fearful, cautious and mistrustful attitude toward the younger generation. Generally speaking, the command-administrative system had no interest in young people getting close to power. That above all.

Everywhere the thesis of correct behavior and a high level of conscientiousness prevailed. And that high level of conscientiousness was manifested by your ability not to take any action contrary to instructions. To do as you had been taught to do. One step to the left or the right... And you were cut down without mercy. All in all I think that the most unhappy people were teachers, who also were not allowed to deviate even one step to the left or the right. They were adults and understood very well what was going on; it was even more difficult and depressing for them! You know, you were a teacher yourself. This was society's attitude toward young people. Authoritarian tutelage is the only term for it.

[Poroykov] There is no arguing with that... We often perceive society in its cross-sectional development: economics, politics, ideology... But a society fixed at one point in time. Today our economy is ailing, and we feel that immediately. But what if we look at a section running lengthwise, across generations: society yesterday, today and tomorrow?

[Ilinskiy] Last year we surveyed 900 young people from five different oblasts. Almost one in five, and one in three among school-age young people, indicated that older people did not understand them. And they were not just talking about differences of opinion about music, clothing and dances.

[Poroykov] Well, what of it? Generally speaking, in my opinion we overly ideologize natural differences in view on life and its many aspects and as a result we get the conflict between generations which has been our bugaboo for decades. But what do we find when we examine it calmly and soberly? A new generation even biologically rejects the older generation it replaces. If it casts doubt on something, so to speak "testing" our ideals before accepting them, why is that necessarily bad?

[Ilinskiy] I am not saying that; I am merely stating the fact that recently differences of opinion between different generations have become more profound. It is one thing to "try out" ideals, testing their durability, it is another thing altogether to reject them simply because they come from a time before us.

Let us not overly dramatize the situation, but there is good reason to speak of a certain crisis of political consciousness among some young people.

Feelings of apathy, pessimism and doubt are on the rise. Less than 40 percent of young people, for example, are sure that our country can achieve the level of labor productivity which exists in the developed capitalist countries, and only one in five feels that we will be able

to raise the people's standard of living substantially in the near future. Approximately 50 percent of the working young people surveyed and 60 percent of the students regard free education and the absence of unemployment as the only advantages of socialism, expressing a preference for capitalism in the economy, solutions to social and consumer problems and the development of people's personal qualities and initiative.

Or consider a complex subject like humanism. Marx equated communism and humanism, which is basically understandable, but... For an absolute majority of people in our country humanism still has a clear-cut material formulation: tolerable pay, good housing, abundance and diversity of food products, high-quality clothing. We do not have these things, and people are looking to those places where they do exist.

[Poroykov] Well, that all follows the laws of classical Marxism: society's living conditions determine society's consciousness. Advantages do not need to be stated, they need to be demonstrated. There are no advantages where there are no achievements. And it would be strange to assume that our highly educated young people do not understand this "social arithmetic."

[Ilinskiy] Yes, the problem has long since outgrown the bounds of political educational work. We must honestly acknowledge that the ability to "implant" socialism in the minds of young generations is exhausted and furthermore is capable of producing the opposite effect.

[Poroykov] That is to say, in other words, whereas for young people this is a matter of choice, for socialism it is a problem of how to win over young people?

[Ilinskiy] Precisely! They say that history has given us one more chance to interpret the way we are living and correct our course. We must not make a mistake again, we must not start building a paradise for future generations, pushing them aside at the very moment we embark upon a new epic. Will we go back to happiness by force, against the people's will? Who gave us the right to do that? Let us discuss seriously with young people and ask them what they want. Because despite all the vices and shortcomings which they have inherited from us they are (thanks to us!) better educated and at the very least no stupider than we are. And there is no doubt that they are bolder, because by observing the example we have set they have seen the whole bestial depravity of fear and lies. Yet in spite of all their pragmatism they are not their parents' enemies.

[Poroykov] Could one say that we are facing something which previously was denied even on the level of terminology: a separate youth subculture and, more importantly, a separate youth consciousness?

[Ilinskiy] Without a doubt! The only thing I would add to what you said is their own perception of paths of social development.

[Poroykov] Their own perception?

[Ilinskiy] Well, let us put the words "their own" in quotes. Of course there is nothing fundamentally new in these views except perhaps, firstly their existence, secondly their diversity and thirdly their extreme popularity. In any case there is no monolithic unity among young people in their views of socialism, its past, present and future...

[Poroykov] We have disturbed normal relations between generations. Each successive generation has been brought up in a spirit of having to repeat and reproduce the preceding generation even in trivial matters. Is this not the reason we have such a powerful potential for conservatism and dogmatism, a potential which opposes new trends?

[Ilinskiy] It is, it is... Therefore I equate fear of innovation with fear of young people. It is no coincidence that often assessments of modern young people by older people are often exclusively negative and at times filled with malice and even hatred.

[Poroykov] Does this perhaps explain what has happened to the Afghanistan veterans? There has been massive condemnation of their so-called "extremism," even though it was actually just an attempt to take a look at our everyday problems from a maximalist standpoint.

[Ilinskiy] I think they looked at human life from a higher perspective. From the standpoint of the value of life itself. Why do I live, why do I fight, why do I die? Discussion of death is also a discussion about life, simply about its final outcome: why did I live? The sooner a person asks himself this question, the sooner he will start living like a human being. I feel that it is a great tragedy that Afghanistan happened. But if we look at it from another standpoint, thousands of young people instantly matured in the face of truth, in the face of an understanding of the essence of life.

[Poroykov] And were horrified.

[Ilinskiy] And were horrified. And when they came home no one understood them. Society was not prepared for the questions that people asked. Just as during restructuring we have jumped decades ahead in our consciousness, so they in one year or in one month under extreme circumstances suddenly became adults. They are different people. They are from a different planet. And to a large extent they have a different philosophy of life.

[Poroykov] To fantasize a bit, how would extraterrestrials look at us? Perhaps through the same eyes?

[Ilinskiy] Perhaps. But I would like to talk about a second aspect. What is happening to young people? They have become alienated from society and have developed their own attitude toward the state and toward social institutions. This has manifested itself in various ways in

different areas. For example, alienation from labor. This is perhaps the most dangerous thing, because it leads to a consumption-oriented attitude, a consumer mentality. Incidentally, I would like to note that consumerism is not what we often see written about. When a person wants to have beautiful things, a car, a dacha, that is not consumerism. Consumerism is when I want to eat well, sleep comfortably and own many things yet do nothing. It is in this sense that consumerism should be combatted, instead of fighting the fact that people want to have nice things. Those things should be produced.

[Poroykov] Only recently have we begun speaking so pointedly about children. At the Congress of People's Deputies there poured forth a flood of terrible information about the condition of our children. It is simply baffling how things could have gotten in such a state. But young people are also children, just a little bit older. So we need to state honestly and frankly in regard to young people: they need charity, too.

[Ilinskiy] What about the hundreds of thousands of young people who are neither working nor studying?

[Poroykov] They form the social basis for youth crime.

[Ilinskiy] And for social tension in society. Furthermore, we still do not know precisely how many unemployed young people there are in our country.

[Poroykov] We are still hesitant to speak plainly about unemployment, most likely for purely psychological reasons. Over and over again events burst upon our country which literally explode in our consciousness: Chernobyl, the "Admiral Nakhimov," Tbilisi, the disaster in the Bashkir ASSR, Fergana... One after another, like some sort of curse. It is hard for older, more experienced people to understand this, so how can young people understand?

[Ilinskiy] That is not the only thing we need to ponder. You are talking about stresses, about the psychology of consciousness. But how can you order a change in the traditional perception of the Komsomol to a completely different one when it has essentially lost its priority and has to prove that it is essential to young people?

[Poroykov] It is clear that the Komsomol should not continue to be what it was in the past. More precisely, it cannot, since it must not be that way. Today we must change many things about its goals and the content of its activities.

[Ilinskiy] Much is already changing. In this regard it is important for us to take one fact into consideration: young people's need for a political organization. Political! And if that is the case it means that it will not have forty million members. And if not forty, then we should regard it as a natural process, not a calamity, that the number of Komsomol members is declining sharply. Things will fall into place naturally. We used to say that

the Komsomol was an educational organization. We were supposed to get as many young people as possible to join and then digest them in the Komsomol. How? By making them all manageable. The sort of people who would not take a step to the left or to the right without being told to. Therefore this crisis was in a way preordained. This word frightens us, though a crisis is merely one stage in development.

In my opinion the Komsomol's current crisis is connected with reinterpretation of its role in society, which is changing the way it looks as well. Society is becoming more and more politicized, and under these circumstances it is inevitable that our youth organization will become politicized as well. The Komsomol should assume an image which will suit both young people and society: the image of an independent political organization which is not the errand boy of the state and the party but instead self-governing and independent in the fullest sense.

[Poroykov] What about the "driving belt"?

[Ilinskiy] This was Stalin's formulation of the Komsomol's mission. He also saw this as the task of trade unions and cooperatives. "Driving belts" and "screws"—all this must of course be discarded. Above all the nature of our relations with the party must change. This should not be a relationship of submission and dictates, but rather of cooperation and interaction. There is even talk of partnership. The word "partnership" does not appeal to me very much. It would be better to have some other type of relations, more democratic, perhaps... I believe that this is possible, just as it is possible to have a youth political organization, because a significant portion of our young people are not merely politicized, but politicized precisely in the communist spirit.

[Poroykov] Doubt was cast on that thesis at the recent Lithuanian Komsomol Congress...

[Ilinskiy] Yes, there were serious discussions there, and they are not finished yet. Specifically, the opinion was expressed that the Komsomol should be neither communist nor Leninist. The word "democratic" was suggested.

[Poroykov] But those are shoes which would fit all the people!

[Ilinskiy] Roughly speaking, yes. Incidentally, one person who spoke during discussion at the congress commented that as long as there exists a world view in this world there will be people who oppose it. And he added: the fact that by a simple majority of votes the Komsomol renounces Marxism-Leninism as its theoretical basis would be nothing more than a model of political ignorance.

[Poroykov] Well stated! And absolutely correct, in my opinion. Let us hope that reason will prevail in these discussions. But in general it should be noted that judging from everything we have seen Komsomol workers face some difficult issues.

[Ilinskiy] The All-Union Komsomol Central Committee plenum is coming up.

[Poroykov] The usual plenum, at which a narrow circle of the "elite" will decide young people's issues for young people?

[Ilinskiy] There will be discussion of the condition of the Komsomol, a new program of action, changes in our charter, new organizational models...

[Poroykov] And yet... does it not seem that the commanders are still conferring on the bridge while the ship and the rest of the crew are steering themselves? Why not follow the party's example and open up a wide-ranging discussion of affairs within the organization, as was done at the 19th Party Conference?

[Ilinskiy] The plenum has its tasks. It is supposed to make decisions based on the range of opinions of which we are aware. There are several alternative concepts which were written by scientists and Komsomol workers. Our center is also submitting its own suggestions...

There are various viewpoints. There are some, for example, who feel that it is possible to pour new wine into old bottles. But I am convinced that that is the wrong course to take. As in all other cases, form and content are interrelated. Of course, you could pour either wine or water into a cup, but every drink must have its own vessel...

[Poroykov] I have already heard something similar to that on one television program. On that show the consciousness was likened to a glass into which for many years something definite and unambiguous has been poured. Now the glass is empty, but if it is not filled again it will sooner or later demand something else to replace what was there before. There was talk of the danger of totalitarian thinking. Of the fact that there is a large group of people who have gotten used to living with that glass and who therefore will demand that it be filled with an alternative content. And the alternative is this: where once there was Stalin, there could now be fascism...

[Ilinskiy] From the standpoint of the mind's needs this is actually a very real problem. Our minds are extremely eclectic, particularly young people's minds. Consider these two facts by way of example: one in five of the young people we surveyed indicated that samizdat is one of their regular sources of information. This in spite of today's level of glasnost, which, it would seem, should fully meet the demand for new knowledge. Or this, which is almost paradoxical: approximately five percent of

young people regard criticism of Stalinism as unnecessary, and 15 percent would be opposed to putting Stalin on trial if that were suddenly to happen. Thus there are young people on the right and on the left, there are centrists and there are those who consciously avoid public affairs... Ignorance, lack of comprehension, uncertainty: these are states which our nature finds intolerable. Social practice has repeatedly proven that people strive to free themselves from these states by any means possible. Obviously this is the reason behind the various forms of social aggression. Things could also turn in the direction of spontaneous demonstrations, strikes and massive hunger strikes, the outcome of which are generally difficult to predict. That is why it is so important for us today to restore the health of our economy, reduce social tension in society and eventually stabilize young people's view of their social prospects. In doing so we should bear in mind that the informal movements or even spontaneous youth groups could fall prey to certain individuals who are not pursuing the most noble political objectives, as happened, for instance, in Fergana or Novyy Uzen.

[Poroykov] And if the Komsomol is unable to normalize its relations with the informal youth movements...

[Ilinskiy] It will simply lose young people! Excuse me, I have no doubts on that score. Today the tension in the youth milieu is fraught with...

[Poroykov] Explosion?

[Ilinskiy] I am afraid that today our whole society is on the point of exploding. As for young people, apparently as a result of age-related characteristics they are always the most radically inclined. In addition to general problems, they are concerned and angered by the fact that most often people do not want to enter into serious discussion with them. For instance, it was no coincidence that one of the main reasons behind the tragedy in Tbilisi was precisely the fact that the Georgian CP Central Committee broke off its dialogue with young people. Young people need a global, frank discussion with society. Society should give them the opportunity to express their opinions, even let them do so first! Look who has instigated recent political incidents. Young people! Now in Lithuania the question has come up: why a communist youth league? Indeed, why? Why do we speak more and more often of democracy simply as democracy and as an ideal simply as an ideal, rather than talking about socialist democracy or a socialist ideal? Some people are already starting to feel that it is anachronistic to talk about socialism. But the idea is not to blame for that. And those who are rejecting it now are not actually rejecting the idea, but rather the Jesuit hood thrown over it by Stalinism. Is that not so? And are not young people correct in their maximalism, they upon whom we, the older generation, poured out the truth about our past? For laudable reasons, purging ourselves,

but poured it out nonetheless. And we should realize what resonance all this has had in young people's spirits. The first response was skepticism. What did we expect, applause? Naive, true...

Now the old promissory notes, one might say, have little value; we need new credit: confidence and faith.

[Poroykov] What real steps could have been taken to improve young people's lives, their morale? Where would it be best to start so that they will, as you put it, issue a new loan of confidence? Is it possible, given the very difficult situation in which our society finds itself today, to raise the possibility of granting certain advantages to young people? But I say again: what about children? The elderly? The poor? Would not new social tension be created in society using that approach, would not people say "they have it all, but we have to wait again"?

[Ilinskiy] Nonetheless... Above all we are suggesting a change in the system of society's attitude toward young people in order to bring about improvement of young people's attitude toward society. This is what we call the state's youth policy. A policy which, naturally, will be backed up financially, legally and organizationally... We have never had this sort of policy, and in that sense it is completely new to us. This idea has also been included in the draft Law on Youth which will be discussed by a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. As I envision it this law will be a legally formulated sociological concept of the relationship between society and young people.

[Poroykov] Quite frankly, even now I do not have much faith in this law as a means of solving the huge number of youth problems which exist. We need to find out why the laws which our country already has are not working or are not working well enough—is this really a trait of our national character, as Saltykov-Shchedrin claimed? Have we not passed enough resolutions on various matters, and have they brought about one iota of progress? Consider the problem of schoolchildren and students being used as agricultural laborers... Or of children in Central Asia working in the cotton fields. What this is, is overt exploitation of child labor which is causing tremendous harm to their health and mental development, about which so much has been written over and over again. But what has come of it? This criminal (there is scarcely any other word for it) practice continues to this day. And each time it is used it is an "exception." An exception to what? To the law. Thus economic interests are placed on a higher level than legal and political interests, or any others one could name.

Does not the same fate await this new Law on Youth by which you set such great store?

[Ilinskiy] Given the current attitude toward young people—yes. But that is the current attitude! We are talking about changing that attitude. And it should, is simply obligated to, change if we are going to think about the

future. Of course it is absurd to think that one law can solve all our problems. This should be precisely a long-range policy. But it is essential that we also take the second step. We will need purposeful programs at the all-union level. Programs, for example, to deal with drug addiction, prostitution, unemployment and construction of housing for young people. Well-planned and well-financed programs. Only in this manner can we work with young people.

[Poroykov] With young people... Or with their direct participation? Should they themselves perhaps be the ones to carry out these programs? Once airplanes are in flight they keep flying thanks to pilots, not designers or inventors... Note, by the way, that you are constantly saying: we should propose, we should develop... If I were 30 years younger I would probably object and say: you are you and I am me. And I myself should be the one to formulate my duty both to society and to my own life. Then it will be my duty, not yours, which you are working so diligently to work out for me...

[Ilinskiy] In principle this is the prerogative of a free society in which each person determines his or her duty. And if a society is imbued with the ideas of humanism and nobility, then the sum of millions of individual spiritual and moral "duties" will be both humane and noble.

But let us return to the main issue. The youth problem exists in two hypostases. As a problem for society, which should be concerned about its younger generation. And as a problem for young people themselves, who in their striving toward self-realization are seeking a field of action. And finding it—either a positive one or a negative one. Take the informal organizations movement, for instance. In some places people are still combatting it, attempting to force it into a mold. I do not understand that... We have expressed the idea that the Law on Youth should be put into effect in stages. It contains a system of benefits, credit and loans, particularly for young families and mothers, and consequently for children as well... And we say: let us begin these in 1990 and gradually expand them. I think that saying there is not enough money ends any discussion of youth policy. Or of young people altogether. If that happens, then society will be setting a limit to its future. We cannot continue to treat young people the way we were treated and are still being treated. Never has anyone in our society even asked themselves how much young people are worth to society. The notion was that all their problems could be solved through education. In other words, everything was reduced to the molding of the consciousness. Yes, young people do need lofty ideas. But they will only follow those who propose a rational, reasonable and honest program. An honest one! Not a new myth, not another big lie...

[Poroykov] Everything we have talked about essentially pertains to the material aspects of young people's lives. But if we get away from the "belly," then what in your

opinion do young people need in terms of the mind? How can we restore spiritual equilibrium and renew faith in ideals, including revolutionary ideals? And what is the Komsomol's role in this process?

[Ilinskiy] I propose that a reasonable youth policy be used to help change the entire system of society's relations with young people. Specifically, a new type of relations between generations has been worked out, based on a dialogue among equals. In my opinion a new concept, a new philosophy of education needs to be created. With a different system of values. Changing the system of values—that is the important thing!

[Poroykov] But does it not seem to you that by pinning our hopes on the function of education we are once again distorting the purpose and the essence of the Komsomol as a spontaneous, self-governing organization? Are we once again setting it above young people and further exacerbating our present crisis?

[Ilinskiy] The difference between the old educational philosophy and the one which we are proposing is, I think, obvious. I would place freedom—freedom of speech, thought and actions—at the top of the new system of moral and intellectual values... Freedom which would predominate over everything else. Today we talk a lot about democracy but it is, of course, just one aspect of freedom. Now about the Komsomol's role. Yes, I have had to prove that the Komsomol is a political organization. At that time, five years ago, this idea, essentially a mundane one, seemed seditious since there were not supposed to be any political organizations in our country besides the party. But I never interpreted a political function as a function of political education. I have always thought and still think today that political education in the form in which it existed for many years is a false function, the result of which was merely the embalming of minds and the filling of them with stereotypes and dogmas.

Society's investment in young people is an investment in itself, in its tomorrow. Unless we are complete egoists we must give thought now to those who will come after us. We must part with the illusion that they will always do only what we, the older generation, want. Much less strive to please us. Many of them are already making up their minds on the issue of whether they are going to be permitted to think with their own brains or once again have to have others think for them. In short, if we want to revive ideals we must first of all make it possible for the social component among young people to be reborn. And when I say that the Komsomol should realize itself precisely as a political organization, then I mean by that that it and all young people have a right to their own views, to independent representation in organs of power,

to the defense and realization of its own programs aimed at improving young people's lives and providing them with constitutional guarantees.

[Poroykov] Is it realistic under the present circumstances, when there are many troubles and gaps, nonetheless remake attitudes toward young people in the near future?

[Ilinskiy] If I said "Certainly!" I would not be worth much, particularly as a scientist. We must have doubts, like all healthy people, because doubt is a part of cognition. And I do have my doubts, but I have faith.

### **Educators Stress Need To Ensure Schools' Economic Health**

18000795 Moscow *EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA*  
in Russian No 51, Dec 88 pp 14-16

[Roundtable conducted by Yu. Tartanov, *EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA* editor at the Department of Labor and Development of the Social Sphere, V. Matveyev, *UCHITELSKAYA GAZETA* editor, and V. Golovachev, *EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA* special correspondent: "New Schools: Economic Support"]

[Text] The Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee held in February of this year examined the problem "On the Course of Restructuring Secondary and Higher Schools and Party Tasks Concerning Its Implementation." It set for public education bodies, pedagogical science, and school teachers the task of focusing attention on developing the concept and content of universal secondary education as basic in the system of workers' continuous education. For this purpose the USSR State Committee for Public Education established the Shkola Provisional Scientific Research Collective (VNIK), which included scientists, workers at public education bodies, school directors, innovative pedagogues, and community representatives.

A draft concept of secondary schools and documents accompanying it have been worked out. New general educational schools are beginning to acquire their visible contours. However, whereas the pedagogical system of new schools appears quite visible, as yet this cannot be said about economic support. There is a mass of unsolved problems here, but the approaches to some of them are just being determined.

At the same time, the widest strata of the public—*EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA* readers (to which the vast editorial mail attests)—show great interest in the ideas that form the foundation for the economy of public education. After all, virtually every Soviet family comes in contact with schools, in whose system millions of teachers work. Here are some statistical data.

**Number of Teachers at Day General Educational Schools  
at the Beginning of the 1987/88 School Year**

	Number of Teachers (without multiple-job holders, thous. people)
All teachers (including school principals) <sup>1</sup>	2807
including:	
Directors of elementary schools	0.5
Directors of incomplete secondary schools	36
Directors of secondary schools	63
Teachers of 1st to 10th (11th) grades (except for teachers who are school principals)	2119
Teachers of music, singing, painting, drawing, physical culture, and manual training	429

As a rule, school principals are simultaneously engaged in teaching.

**Number of Students According to Types of Education  
(at the beginning of the school year; mill. people)**

	1975/76	1980/81	1987/88
In general educational schools	47.6	44.3	43.8
In vocational and technical educational institutions	3.4	4.0	4.3
In secondary specialized educational institutions	4.5	4.6	4.4
In higher educational institutions	4.9	5.2	5.0

Taking into consideration the vast importance of economic support for new schools, on the threshold of the All-Union Congress of Workers in Public Education

EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA jointly with UCHITELSKAYA GAZETA held a meeting on these problems.

**E. Dneprov, director of the Shkola Provisional Scientific Research Collective of the USSR State Committee for Public Education**

**"Investment in Education Is the Most Humanistic of Economist Tasks"**

I think that I will not be especially original if at the very beginning of our discussion I state: The economy of public education is one of the neglected areas of both the economy as a whole and of our entire pedagogical science. In the last few years, as a matter of fact, no one—neither leading economists nor pedagogues—have touched upon the basic problems in the economy of education. In essence, only timid attempts in an atmosphere with a semblance of an interested discussion have been made.

Not having a unified concept of economic support for schools, in advance we doom ourselves to patching holes and solving only partial problems of their development, which occurred with the 1984 school reform. Please recall that even such good measures of ours as an increase in teachers' wages did little to improve the entire system of public education.

So, what kind of economic support for new schools do we see?

**From the VNIK Draft "Concept of General Secondary Education"**

In a civilized society education is the most important social and economic program. In the final analysis, the level and quality of education determine the level of the country's well-being. Therefore, it is customary to consider capital investments in education the most profitable.

An investment in education is the most humanistic of economic tasks. This is an investment in man, in uncovering his potentials, and in forming the country's most important strategic resource.

It is economically absurd to invest funds in industrial enterprises, agriculture, and science, while skimping on financing the education of people who will work in these sectors. In the last 30 years the share of national income assigned for the needs of education dropped from 10 to 7.2 percent. The rates of resource support for education lag behind the financing of material production tenfold.

If we want our country to be really renewed and reach the most advanced targets in the world, we must place education in the system of priorities, give up its residual financing, and increase the share of national labor invested in education.

It is just as necessary to embark on the decentralization of expenditures on education and a decisive financial emancipation of schools.

Not only central, but also local, Soviet bodies of power should determine the sum of expenditures on education. The practice of withdrawing into the centralized budget the part of enterprise profit that subsequently is included in expenditures on education should be given up. These funds can be transferred directly to local bodies of power. Local soviets of people's deputies also have the right to review the matter of the amount of payment for labor resources stipulated in the Law on the State Enterprise (Association) and to readdress part of the tax on cooperative associations and persons engaged in individual labor activity for the needs of education.

The formation of a regional fund for the development of public education by attracting local and sectorial resources and contributions of enterprises, institutions, and individual citizens, establishing an internal production sphere for education, and so forth is the most important task of soviets of people's deputies and public education councils.

The financial emancipation of schools should proceed along two lines: Granting them the right to independently use the allocated budgetary appropriations and the right to form an internal school fund, whose resources are spent at school councils' discretion.

In the use of their budgets schools are now bound hand and foot. These budgets are apportioned according to cemented "honeycombs" of an estimate of expenditure items, which rule out any possibility for a reasonable financial maneuver. However, life does not fit into "honeycombs." It requires a dynamic reaction, prompt decisions, and socialist enterprise.

Schools should have the right to independently work out an estimate within the limits of the allocated appropriations and to determine items or programs of expenditures according to it, providing for a mandatory allocation of normative expenditures on the wage fund and social insurance of school workers, children's meals, and depreciation allowances.

Wages can be calculated according to two channels: from state allocations—within the limits of the "fork" of salaries—and from the resources of the schools' own funds.

The schools' own funds are formed from the following basic sources: deductions from the local budget for the school development program; specific investments of

ministries, sectorial departments, base and other enterprises, state institutions, higher educational institutions, public organizations, associations, cooperatives, and so forth; voluntary contributions by parents and other citizens; income from the provision of paid services by schools, including from the leasing out of school premises and installations, implements, equipment, and other resources; income from the economic activity of the schools themselves (school farms, associations, shops, student production brigades, and so forth).

Financial resources of schools should be at their full disposal and not be subject to withdrawal. School councils can concentrate these resources on key directions in the development of schools and establish on a contractual basis—with other schools, out-of-school and scientific institutions, and state and cooperative enterprises—various interschool combines, courses, industrial training and economic associations, and school cooperatives.

All this will free schools from the web of countless financial instructions and normatives, enable them to straighten their shoulders, and give a strong impetus to their development.

The renewal of schools is the way:

—from departmental autocracy to democracy in schools;

—from residual to priority financing of education;

—from the financial emancipation of schools to their economic independence.

It has long become an axiom that the state that economizes on education is eternally doomed to catching up. It seems to me that the residual principle of financing is the consequence of provincial political thinking and of the lack of responsibility before the future and history. The bough on which we sit should not be hewn.

Unfortunately, and this is no secret to anyone, after the works by Doctor of Economic Sciences Vitaliy Alekseyevich Zhamin, winner of the USSR State Prize, who is present here, we do not know of many serious acquisitions in the economy of public education. And what is being done at the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences is extremely insufficient, to say the least. This has also not been a secret to teachers for a long time. For the present the residual principle with respect to the economy of public education also predominates in our science. Only by changing our approach will we build truly new schools.

Of course, it would be simply foolish to deny the right to the existence of different models of economic support for schools. I believe, however, that their essence will be the



same: In addition to state allocations, other sources of financing—various public funds, resources of the population itself, enterprises, and departments, and other resources—must be used.

**P. Khudominskiy, director of the Scientific Research Institute of Management and Economics of Public Education of the USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, doctor of economic sciences**

#### **"Danger of Appearance of 'New' Formalism Exists"**

I am ready to agree: In fact, matters concerning the economy and financing of schools and economic support for them are key problems. All our previous school reforms failed mainly because we built castles in the air, forgetting that real resources are needed for the realization of plans and ideas. Let us recall the last 1984 reform, when we loudly announced education for all children from the age of 6, the completion of universal secondary education, and universal vocational education. Already then it was clear: A successful realization of what is envisaged is problematical, to put it mildly. Today, no matter how much we may work out concepts (academic and VNIK concepts and whatever you like), if they are

not placed on a firm economic foundation and material prerequisites for their realization are not established, we will get, as a result, another soap bubble, which is sure to burst.

I also agree with the fact that the economy of public education is in an embryonic state and many problems not only have not been solved, but have not even been raised. Our Institute for the Management and Economics of Public Education, finally, was established 2 years ago. However, it was established according to the old principle: Perhaps something will come about, even if there are no resources for this "something." This resulted in a kind of curtailed institution with very few economists—only 12. Accordingly, the institute's return is also low.

To save on schools and on public education means to be deadlocked. I will cite only one figure out of the closed data: Expenditures per student, on the average, are on the order of 300 rubles annually.

#### **EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA clarification:**

These figures are already open. For specialists' information we cite the latest data obtained by the editorial department from the USSR State Committee for Statistics.

#### **According to Data of the USSR State Committee for Statistics**

##### **State Expenditures on the Maintenance of One Student in Educational Institutions per Year (rubles)**

	1975	1980	1985	1986	1987
Maintenance of one student in general educational schools	166	194	239	257	284
Maintenance of one student in vocational and technical schools	672	723	781	840	863
Maintenance of one student in secondary specialized educational institutions	635	704	781	805	876
Maintenance of one student in higher educational institutions	987	1081	1221	1245	1325

#### **P. Khudominskiy:**

For comparison: In developed foreign countries, even without taking into account the difference in official and unofficial currency rates, these expenditures are five to eight times higher. I think that we should strive for the development of a goal-oriented public education program similar to that established for public health. I

consider the cause of public education primarily a state matter and in any, the most complex, economic situation the state should search for the funds for it. Otherwise, the problem will not be solved.

At the same time, it is necessary to search for and find additional sources of financing. When general problems concerning regional cost accounting and expansion of

the economic independence of local soviets of people's deputies are being solved, it is necessary to implement measures to ensure school financing and to determine the constantly increasing deductions of labor collectives of enterprises on this territory for school needs.

The income of cooperatives is another source. A sensible practice, when a firm or an enterprise transfer a part of their profits for charitable purposes, public health, and education and in this case are exempt from taxes, exists in a number of foreign countries.

At the same time, the idea of enlisting school sponsors from ministries and departments expressed by E. Dneprov seems somewhat debatable. Ministries should transfer additional resources not directly to schools, but, let us suppose, to the fund of the public education council, or to the fund of the local soviet of people's deputies. Let the councils themselves distribute the resources.

Finally, with respect to the economic activity of the schools themselves and the use of cost accounting and self-financing elements. Here we must be realists and proceed from the fact that this channel cannot become a leading one. To pay such a price at the expense of lowering the level of students' development and training would be inadvisable, to say the least. In fact, students' labor can be one of the sources of income, but an additional one. For example, I know a number of schools in Moscow, where student cooperatives have been established and give a definite economic effect. It would be possible to utilize the experience of Hungary and other socialist countries, where, for example, school premises—pools, gymnasiums, and school restaurants for cafes—are leased out on Saturdays and Sundays. Again, however, all these are only additional sources of negligible income.

And another key problem: It is time to put an end to leveling in teachers' salaries.

#### **EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA:**

Has science already determined the criteria of the quality of instruction by individual teachers?

#### **P. Khudominskiy:**

This question is extremely complex. In fact, a real danger of appearance of a "new" formalism exists. At one time the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences jointly with the then USSR Ministry of Education tried to develop criteria for evaluating the activity of the pedagogue and the school. It was agreed that there should not be quantitative indicators leading to a "show," but qualitative ones. Everything ended at this. Incidentally, nor are qualitative indicators a panacea. To be sure, the school's

pedagogical council, taking into consideration parents' opinion, should decide on the question whether the teacher is good or bad and whether the salary corresponds to his labor.

#### **E. Dneprov:**

Consequently, science remains on the sidelines, saying: Let the teachers themselves decide?

#### **V. Lebedev, docent at the Moscow Oblast Institute for Advanced Teachers' Training:**

It is as with a bad television set. Not consumers, but workers at the producing enterprise, evaluate its quality. And this will happen in schools if teachers evaluate each other. Can this be objective?

#### **P. Khudominskiy:**

Nevertheless, primarily professionals should evaluate the work of a professional and society's opinion should be merely taken into consideration. Otherwise, the situation resembles the situation that would arise if patients evaluated the method of performing a surgery.

#### **E. Dneprov:**

It is not a question of evaluating methods. The school exists for the student and the student has the right to participate in evaluating the results of labor of those who teach him. The patient has the right to evaluate the results of a surgeon's work. However, you replace the evaluation of the result with the evaluation of the method.

#### **P. Khudominskiy:**

You talk about whomever you like, but you have forgotten about the teacher. At first I thought that this was accidental, but now I am beginning to think that this is the result of a certain tendency—an underestimate of significance, of the level of skills, and of professionalism. Moreover, I would say that this is a course of encouraging dilletantism.

#### **Ye. Saburov, head of a laboratory of the Shkola Temporary Scientific and Technical Collective:**

It is not right to evaluate oneself. Schools should reject this. If the financial life of schools depends on whether students want to study there or not, teachers will have a totally different attitude toward their work.

Schools should have their own accounts in the bank, their own sources of financing, and, naturally, the possibility of attracting additional funds. Above all, let the evaluation of the economic activity of schools be made from the consumer's side. Then no one will have the right to dictate to them on what funds should be spent.

I completely disagree with the idea that enterprises should deduct money to some council, not to a specific school. Under self-financing conditions labor collectives of enterprises themselves decide where to assign their own earned funds. Incidentally, they already give and will give funds to schools, where children of cost-accounting enterprise workers study; for example, in Cherepovets and Simferopol.

#### EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA:

The editorial department has recently received many letters, in which the authors propose and even demand the introduction of cost-accounting elements in specific schools. This flow will intensify especially after the February (1988) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, which examined the problem "On the Course of Restructuring Secondary and Higher Schools and Party Tasks Concerning Its Implementation." It openly discussed the creation over a long-term period of conditions for a partial self-support of schools and the need to search, not only in the center, but also in localities, for additional opportunities to develop and strengthen the educational base. Here is a characteristic letter from the latest mail:

"Right now from the first school grades it would be advisable to form microgroups inside individual grades on the basis of individual inclinations and interests, which would make it possible, from the very beginning of children's stay in schools, to better uncover and develop their individual characteristics. Under conditions of primarily economic methods of management and their penetration into all spheres of activity teaching children in microgroups on the basis of interests could be organized on a cost-accounting basis, attracting the funds of the population and interested enterprises.

"It would be desirable, as a feedback, to learn the opinion of members of the Shkola Temporary Scientific Research Collective on this score."

[Signed] *L. Bezrukova, Moscow.*

What shall we answer the reader?

**Ye. Saburov:**

Parents' expenses on their children do not seem to me something terrible. Conversely, this is good. And then I don't think that the expenses will be big. For example, in Simferopol an additional payment of 30 rubles per student is suggested. Trade-union organizations of enterprises, where parents work, agree to pay 20 of them. This is not so much. On the other hand, parents' attitude toward children's studies changes.

**V. Volkonskiy, chief scientific associate at the Central Economic and Mathematical Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, doctor of economic sciences:**

I don't agree that specific payments for schools should be demanded from enterprises. They should enter the budget of the local soviet. Later some part should be allocated by the council for the financing of a specific school. It knows better the needs of residents and schools in its rayon.

Nevertheless, I like the program proposed by VNIK. We have somehow gotten used to the idea that only the state and a specific department can competently guide education. In my opinion, this is not correct. In general, most of the functions can be performed not through the state, not through officials, but through public organizations. The proposed concept solves such a problem.

**V. Zhamin, professor at Moscow State University, doctor of economic sciences:**

Attempts to create a new school model can only be welcomed. The shortcoming of the past reform consisted in the fact that there was no overall approach. It was simply dictated from above: There should be vocational education and such-and-such occupations.

I warmly support the idea of regional school financing and, in general, developing independence of soviets of people's deputies in the solution of problems of public education. I had occasion to visit many countries. I was in the United States, Canada, and some others. Everywhere municipalities have a decisive effect on education. They are the main figures in providing and supplying schools. They have special warehouses and film libraries for this.

So, let us also give our local soviets of people's deputies rights: where to open a school, where to close it, and how to finance it. They should be true headquarters, including economic. And our business with you is to give general methodological guidelines.

**V. Novichkov, deputy director of the Moscow Oblast Institute for Advanced Teachers' Training:**

You say that independence should be given to soviets. In fact, any enterprise should pay the soviet for the use of labor resources. However, it is necessary to pay not merely for the use of labor resources, but with due regard for the coefficient of education of this "labor resource" itself.

**L. Yevdokimova, senior scientific associate at the Scientific Research Economic Institute under the USSR Gosplan:**

It has been said here that individual "strong" ministries can fully maintain schools. Will we not thereby strengthen the differentiation of the material base of schools? Will there be no negative effect?

**E. Dneprov:**

I don't see this. We take a realistic stand. Now differentiation works for education. Lagging schools together with soviets will seek ways of reaching the level of advanced schools.

**L. Yevdokimova:**

Nevertheless, additional sources cannot yet be attracted everywhere.

**T. Medvedeva, director of the Lyubertsy Secondary School No 42, RSFSR honored school teacher:**

Let us all together go down to earth. The most serious problems of school life—material and technical provision—must be solved today. In all plans we stand in the column of other consumers. Therefore, we can buy neither glass, nor drying oil, nor paint. We virtually cannot buy anything. The school has neither limits, nor a fund, nor money. The furniture in schools, technical means of instruction, and visual aids—all these become obsolete much more rapidly than we manage to renew. As a rule, schools lack sports and hiking equipment.

Nevertheless, our school is in good standing. We have both a pool and two gymnasiums. However, how difficult it is to maintain our beautiful and, one can say, unique building in the proper condition and order!

Our school is now 18 years old. Sanitary and electrical equipment, the boiler room, and the woodworking shop—all these gradually get out of order and require constant current repairs. I propose that special repair and construction administrations be established in cities and that appropriate allocations be given to them at the expense of local soviets.

The extended-day group is another unsolved problem. There are 35 children in a group. They stay there from 8 am till 6 pm. What does this mean? Think about this. This is a 10-hour work day. In addition, extended-day groups in schools have not been placed on any material base. Previously, we at least were able to buy toys in

stores. Now, since nothing is sold without cash transactions, we cannot buy them.

**According to Data of the USSR State Committee for Statistics**

**Proportion of Students in Extended-Day Groups in Total Number of 1st-8th Graders (in percent)**

	School year		
	1980/81	1985/86	1987/88
Total	32	37	30
In urban areas	30	32	25
In rural areas	35	44	38

**T. Medvedeva:**

And another thing. Let us take our Lyubertsy. The city is densely populated, but we have neither a palace of pioneers, nor a station of young technician, nor a proper industrial training combine. Even the city department of public education is cooped up on premises, on which it is not only complicated, but also dangerous, to work. And we are surprised: Where do "difficult children" come from?!

**M. Alekhin, chief of a subdepartment of the Consolidated Department for Social Development and Labor of the USSR Gosplan:**

In fact, the material base of public education greatly lags behind present requirements. Hence, for example, the increase in the shift system in recent years. The following data can be cited:

**According to Data of the USSR State Committee for Statistics  
General Educational Day Schools (at the beginning of the school year)**

	1975/76	1980/81	Total 1985/86	1986/87	1987/88
Number of students, mill.	42.6	39.5	41.3	41.9	42.6
Of them study, in percent of the total number:					
in the first shift	76.9	80.0	78.8	78.2	77.5
in the second shift	23.0	19.9	21.1	21.7	22.4
in the third shift	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1

In many respects such indicators are largely the legacy of the period of stagnation. It seems that this problem can be solved on a normative basis, which has already been taken into account to a significant extent in long-term plans.

Improvement in the organization of wages in the sector is perhaps no less painful a problem. A draft of the appropriate document has already been prepared and is in the government. It has been prepared according to principles, which to some extent have been approved in the production sphere. For example, normatives of formation of the salary or wage fund and various sources of

financing have been envisaged. There was a more complex situation with the selection of indicators of final results, according to which labor expenditures and the wage fund could be computed. However, even such proposals have now been prepared and sent to the USSR Council of Ministers for consideration.

In particular, one of the variants envisages a more effective bonus system. It will "cost" the budget 510 million rubles. Finally, beginning from the 14th Five-Year Plan every 5 years it is envisaged revising rates and salaries simultaneously in production and nonproduction sectors. Consequently, an overall approach to the problem will be ensured.

**According to Data of the USSR State Committee for Statistics  
Average Monthly Wages of Workers and Employees (in rubles)**

	1970	1980	1985	1987
Throughout the national economy	122.0	168.9	190.1	202.9
Public education, total	108.1	135.9	150.0	165.6
including in percent of the national economy	88.6	80.5	78.9	81.6

**EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA:**

Cooperatives in the system of public education were discussed only in passing. Their effect on the rising generation and the inculcation in it of a respectful attitude toward labor and economic competence can be significant, although the attitude of specialists toward school cooperatives is ambiguous.

**V. Butenko, chairman of the "Fathers and Children"  
School Cooperative (Moscow Oblast):**

I want to give information on the economic activity of our cooperative, one of the 337 cooperatives operating in the country. Perhaps it will help someone to change his point of view of this movement.

We have hundreds of children. Their wages are 20 to 30 rubles per month. We additionally pay the teacher 10 percent of the student's wages. The school receives 5 percent of the depreciation [allowances].

The principle of the cooperative's operation is simple: Production waste is acquired from industrial enterprises. From it children make lace aprons and dresses, cuffs, collars, bags, soft toys, table games, and even... mops—in all, 50 types of articles, almost each of which is not to be found in any store.

No one imposes on the young cooperative worker what he should do. Everyone is free to choose for himself, to improvise, and to invent... The chief thing is to avoid rejects. Then the cooperative takes upon itself the trouble of selling finished products in Balashikha and Moscow department stores. These scarce products are sold at prices below state prices!

In 1 year alone children participating in the cooperative's operation provided services worth almost 200,000 rubles to the population of Balashikha and Moscow.

The additional pay for teachers is also significant. The fact that the school gets ready cash is also important. It has already been stated that nothing can be bought through noncash transactions.

I like an enquiry by means of a questionnaire. The survey shows that with their earned money most of our children would like to invite lecturers with lectures for them and for their parents, English and French teachers, mathematicians, and programmers. This also applies to the question of the possibility of paid education.

Now about the educational functions of labor. As is well known, it is prohibited to draw children into labor if this is not connected with training and education. However, who can say what labor is not connected with training and education?!

For example, in our cooperative children work voluntarily and with satisfaction and, what is most important, they really learn to get what they earn.

**V. Novichkov:**

It would be good if EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA would also somehow support the remarkable experience of the school cooperative. In fact, this business meeting is its propaganda.

**T. Klyachko, senior scientific associate at the IEP NTP of the USSR Academy of Sciences:**

Returning to the subject of paid education, I would like to note the following: We now begin to deal with the fact that, not having resources for the development of education, we want to attract the population's resources for it. I think that this is not bad. Why? Because it is very important for the consumer to be able to control with the ruble the actions of those that provide education.

Nevertheless, we should realize that throughout the world since 1960 expenditures on education increased more than 12-fold, but in our country, approximately 4.5-fold. It is quite difficult to estimate the return on education. Specialists from developed countries maintain that in these countries up to 30 percent of the growth of national income is at the expense of education.

Another thing disturbs me. A very interesting book "Crisis in Education" was published in the West in the 1960's. It stated the following: If teachers' salaries grow more slowly than they rise, on the whole, in other sectors, public education receives personnel of an obviously worse quality than other sectors. The conclusion: Teachers' salaries should also rise in our country not merely in the same proportion as in the national economy, but more rapidly, outstripping them.

Moreover, in our country at present the total number of graduates from secondary specialized pedagogical schools is increasing and from pedagogical institutes, decreasing. Consequently, we knowingly worsen the structure of pedagogical personnel in the country.

**According to Data of USSR State Committee for Statistics**

**Total Number of Specialists Graduating From Pedagogical Institutes and Schools in the USSR (thous. people)**

	1975	1980	1985	1987
Pedagogical institutes	138.5	149.8	155.6	138.8
Pedagogical schools	83.7	91.5	113.7	137.3

And what about recent graduates? How do they improve their professional qualities? And do we help them? Do we give them incentives as prescribed? Let us see. Practice has shown that the teacher works creatively during the first 5 years. During that time he is eager to work, is ready for innovations, and constantly engages in a search. After 5 years the activity curve begins to drop sharply. He gets used to existing conditions and considers himself a professional. But his salary is raised. Apparently, young teachers should have relatively higher salaries, not as now: After 3 years of work we raise them, after 10 years we raise them, after 18 years..., that is, it turns out that one has to stay for a certain time—and his salary is raised.

**T. Medvedeva:**

I don't agree. When a young specialist comes to school, he should have a mentor. I have in mind a teacher with experience in work, which young specialists do not have. For this he should receive an additional payment. Strictly speaking, the salary should also be differentiated.

**V. Vilkov, chief of a department at the USSR State Committee for Public Education:**

I agree with T. Klyachko. A special scale of additional payments exists in a number of socialist countries. The first salary rise is after 6 months of work by the young specialist. After 2 years his salary is raised again. However, we receive these kinds of letters from teachers: A young teacher and I, who have a great deal of experience, work, but we earn the same.

Of course, it is incorrect to say that levers controlling teachers' salaries totally do not exist in our country. There are payments in addition to salaries and rates for the titles "Honored School Teacher," People's Teacher, "Teacher in Methods," and others. However, the role of these levers is weak. The amount of teacher's labor can be regulated to some degree: An additional payment for class tutorship and for correcting exercise papers can be introduced. However, even this gives little. For now we follow the path of increasing a load, a path fraught with serious consequences. The teacher accumulates a significant number of lessons to the detriment of the quality of instruction.

In the future it is necessary to change the salary system as a whole. For example, MIFI [Moscow Engineering-Physics Institute] has a school under its patronage, which is about to change over to the contract basis of payment. Contracts will be concluded with teachers for 2 years and longer. Teachers are ready to accept such a payment in order to have a bigger salary (MIFI intends to pay them additionally). The school will be able to select the best teachers and to invite them to it.

It is time to raise the significance of the teacher's labor, to adopt the contract, and to outstrip the salary level as compared with the material sphere.

#### From the Editorial Department:

All problems, no matter how interesting and sharp their discussion may be, cannot be covered at one meeting. Nevertheless, it seems that we have touched upon the key ones, those that the All-Union Congress of Workers in Public Education will have to discuss together with problems of humanization and democratization of school education, openness of schools to the influence of public forces, and increase in their independence in the structure of public-state management. All the proposals by participants in the meeting at the editorial department, as well as those previously expressed in *EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA* publications entitled "Into Big Life" (No 4), "Adult Games" (No 6), "Outstripping Education" (No 10), "How To Light a Torch" (No 11), "The Pedagogical Poem Continues" (No 14), "The School of Tomorrow Is the School of Self-Development of Personality" (No 35), "The School With A View of the Field" (No 48), and others, of course, will help the USSR State Committee for Public Education, which is called upon to implement the decisions adopted by the congress.

#### Formation of All-Union Ethnographic Service Proposed

18300737 Moscow *POLITICHESKOYE OBRAZOVANIYE* in Russian No 7, May 89 pp 22-28

[Article by V. V. Pimenov, doctor of history, professor, head of the Chair of Ethnography of the Department of History of Moscow State University imeni M. V. Lomonosov: "A State All-Union Ethnographic Service Is Needed. Proposals to the Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee on Interethnic Relations"]

[Text] I am deeply convinced: We need a State All-Union Ethnographic Service [GVES] in our country, and the sooner it will be created, the better. One can confidently assert that, if it had been organized sooner, then the present-day ethnic conflicts would not have acquired their present sharpness.

Generally speaking, it seems strange that in a country where the nationality composition is so complex and mixed (more than 100 nations, nationalities and ethnic groups), one has to demonstrate that it is necessary to

make a careful study of the people living here, and for the improvement of the organization of the live of these peoples we should have special scientific and governmental organs. One of the reasons why the idea of the creation of a GVES has not yet found the desired number of supporters and why such a service has not been created up to now lies in the fact that the declaration of the scientific substantiation and study of government decisions in the sphere of inter-nationality relations simply remain declarations, and in the country meanwhile general ethnographic ignorance holds sway. It would hardly be an exaggeration to say that today's graduates of secondary schools, *tekhnikums*, and *VUZ's*, as a rule, not only cannot name more than two dozen peoples living in the USSR, but cannot even enumerate the capitals of the union republics. Still sadder is the fact that an extremely broad stratum of the leading officials in the party, administration, and economy either feel no need to acquire ethnographic knowledge at all, or do not have any idea of where such knowledge can be obtained. In the society circulate not so much scientific knowledge about the peoples living in our state, about their origin, customs, cultural achievements and urgent problems, as commonplace ideas, frequently aggravated by narrow-minded prejudices and stereotypes.

Until very recently, the development of ethnography has not been given either the proper significance, or the requisite scope. This was an obvious error. In part, the ethnographers themselves are at fault, since they failed to propagate adequately the important improvements that have taken place in the science of ethnography in the past few decades. Meanwhile, the content of this science in our time differs radically from that traditional and, I will put it frankly, somewhat ridiculous image which, unfortunately, still prevails in the mass consciousness and presents this discipline as a method for the satisfaction of the interest in the exotic phenomena in the culture of the peoples or as a simple description of their way of life and morals.

However, present-day ethnography in our country is, to a significant extent, already another science, another science even in comparison with what it was 25-30 years ago. There have been important innovations in its theoretical-methodological principles, methods and techniques of research. Our ethnography, with full justification, lays claim to the role of a special branch of social science, which studies the regularities of the origin, development, composition and functioning of ethnic groups (peoples), including the diverse relations between them and the prediction of the corresponding processes in the foreseeable future. Present-day ethnography is not only a theoretical and empirical science, but also a field of science which has practical and applied significance. In support of this, I could cite a sufficiently long list of ethnographic and ethnosociological works, which shows that ethnographers have not been idle, but have been engaged in a serious business, one which is extremely important for the country. The only trouble is that people paid too little attention to their conclusions.

The question may arise, why precisely it is an ethnographic service that we are talking about. First of all, it should be said that it is not the name which is the point. The proposed system of scientific institutions of an applied character (its possible structure will be discussed below) can bear any name you like, but the its sense must be the following: The systematic and regular scientific research into the most important present-day intra-nationality (intra-ethnic) and inter-nationality (inter-ethnic) processes, the collection and processing of the appropriate information, the exposure of the existing and projected trends, and the formulation of scientifically-substantiated proposals for the governmental organs, proposals aimed at the optimization of the indicated processes. In this lies the sense, essence and quintessence of the whole undertaking. We are talking precisely about a scientific approach, about the scientific study of administrative, economic, organizational and other solutions and measures. The participants in this work should include specialists who know how to express what they have to say, basing themselves not only on intuition and commonplace prejudices about the subject, but on scientific knowledge.

However, who are they, these specialists? People often say (and this is absolutely correct) that the nationality problem is a complex problem and that scholars of various specialties must take part in its study and in the development of proposals for its solution. Correct. Obviously, the coordinated efforts of economists, lawyers, sociologists, demographers, economic geographers, physicians, and, possibly, other specialists.

All this is so, but practice, as is well known, introduces its corrections. Not too long ago, in connection with the construction of a gas pipeline cutting through the peninsula of Taymyr in latitudinal direction (the pipes of which, with a thickness of up to 2 meters, were laid on the surface of the tundra), the paths of seasonal (meridional) migration of domestic and wild reindeer were grossly disturbed. Not only the herds of many thousands of reindeer turned out to be threatened, but also the life of a whole people—the Nganasans, who are engaged in the pasture of these domestic reindeer and the hunt of wild ones. Who raised a voice in defense of the Nganasans? Perhaps the economists, the specialists in the distribution of productive forces, the officials of Gosplan? No, the ethnographers. They sounded the alarm, as the result of which, in the end, special passageways for the reindeer herds were made. It is clear that, had the plan for the pipeline gone through an expert examination by ethnographers prior to the beginning of construction, the problem could have found an optimal solution.

One can also recall that our central planning organs (that is again the economists) labored considerably in order to bring about the excessive intensification of the development of labor-intensive and resource-intensive sectors of industry in Latvia and Estonia. This required the attraction of significant contingents of labor resources from the outside. What this led to, is known to everyone. I

dare say, however, that the serious study of this question with ethno-sociologists and ethnographers would have made it possible to find more successful variants of the economic development in these two republics.

The facts that have been cited are merely something that lies almost on the surface. There are more complex and difficult questions, which require fundamental research and deep thought. Here is one of them. The main productive force in any society, ours included, is man, the worker. The totality of people, who are able to work, constitutes the labor resources. Labor resources have their quantitative and qualitative characteristics—numerical size, qualifications, etc. Strictly speaking, it is with these characteristics that economists work in making calculations of the labor resources, calculating their balance, potential, etc. And it occurs to few that such an approach to the matter is too abstract; perhaps it is convenient in pure theory, but it suffers from the disregard of important aspects of reality. As a matter of fact, that same “labor resource” we are discussing has not only hands, but also a multitude of ethnic qualities and aspects—nationality, a historically developed culture, customs, traditional and non-traditional labor habits, a habit of work rhythm and working conditions, a national language in which it communicates at the work place, in the family, and public life, and a great deal more, which transforms it from the abstract unit of labor resources into a concrete personality and a concrete worker.

It goes without saying that these qualities are not eternal, they can change rather suddenly, but at every given moment in history they are present, and it is impossible not to take them into consideration. But one must think about them, one must know about them, and they must be studied in order not to make serious mistakes in arriving at serious decisions. In the 1970's, when the question arose concerning the restoration of agriculture in the depopulated villages of the Non-Chernozem zone of the RSFSR, in the depths of the USSR Gosplan the idea was born to put this work on an international basis. In particular, there was talk that the country's republics with a labor-surplus, including Uzbekistan, would help the Non-Chernozem Zone, having sent significant contingents of workers to work in agriculture to a permanent place of residence. Responsible officials, it would seem, took the decision concerning the resettlement of the Uzbek peasants, who were accustomed to raising southern crops, to Ivanovo, Kostroma, Novgorod, and other similar oblasts, where it is necessary to take up rye, oats, potatoes, flax, etc. And nobody thought about whether these settlers will be able to adapt to a completely different climate and landscape, to different cultural and language conditions. No one raised the question of how the local population will perceive the appearance of new inhabitants of another nationality, and what will have to be done in order to organize their amicable cooperation.

It is not difficult to guess that this whole undertaking of the times of Brezhnev and Rashidov was of practically no significant use either to the Non-Chernozem Zone or



to the development of mutual inter-nationality assistance. The Uzbek peasants were not in any too great a hurry to leave for the new places of residence, and those few who arrived there soon returned. The whole undertaking cost a considerable amount of money, but the effect of this investment proved to be negligible. And again it should be noted that both problems—the theoretical (concerning the ethnic parameters of the task of labor resources), as well as the applied (concerning the concrete, not well-thought-out attempt to shift the labor resources) were raised not by the economists, but by the ethnosociologists and ethnographers.

I will cite one more fact, which relates to sphere of the legal defense of the interests of peoples and ethnic groups. At the end of October 1988, a conference took place in Petrozavodsk, at which the position of the small people, the Veps, was discussed, who live in the south of the Karelian ASSR, in the southeast of Leningrad and the northwest of Vologda oblasts. The question was the development of the economy which had been almost to a crash, the construction of roads which were lacking in the territory, the poor medical and other services, the restoration of the Veps written language, the study of the Veps language in the schools, the publication of a newspaper in this language, and other such extremely important questions. All the speakers—both the representatives of the Veps and other speakers—amicably agreed that one of the most important reasons leading to the present, in essence crisis, situation lies in the fact that the Veps turned out to be dispersed between 7 administrative rayons of 2 oblasts and one autonomous republic; moreover, even in these rayons they found themselves in the most remote, outlying corners, in the "backwaters" [ozadki]. It goes without saying that the not too abundant financial and material resources accumulated in the rayon centers and the zones gravitating toward them, and the equipment of the remote, in this case Veps, villages remained "for later."

They have begun to think about how to correct the matter now. By itself the proposal matured about the creation of a Veps autonomous district (okrug), in which the Veps could, though not all at once, but step by step, solve their own problems. They proposed that it would be most expedient to join such a district to the Karelian ASSR, where in the course of many years a certain experience in work with ethnic groups of the population has been acquired. However, here a legal (constitutional) obstacle came to light, which consists in the fact that autonomous districts, according to the Constitution, are formed in the composition of krais and oblasts, but not autonomous republics.

Such is the sense of the collision that has arisen. Who discovered this collision, who raised the question about it, who attracted the attention of the public, the party and state organs to it? The lawyers, perhaps? No, it was the ethnographers, the ethnosociologists, and some other specialists, with the good support of the Soviet Cultural Fund, who did this and continue to do it.

Everything that was stated above, it goes without saying, was written not in order to cast a shadow on colleagues working in other spheres of social science. It turns out that way because everyone is simply engaged in "his own thing," and the affairs of his neighbors retire to the background by themselves. This is still another example of the typical departmental dissociation in science. It is precisely to overcome the existing dissociation that the GVES is called upon. The most diverse specialists need to be involved in its work, but nevertheless, as experience shows, it is easier and more convenient for the professional ethnographer to see the problem, to raise it, and to understand the methods of its study.

Why does it happen this way? For the simple reason that for almost any specialist, except the ethnographer, the national (ethnic) problems are the periphery of his interests; besides, it is an extremely poorly-studied sphere, the intensified study of which is accompanied by the risk of turning out to be a dilettante, and simply end up being in hot water. Finally, the specialists in the other spheres of knowledge, besides ethnography, even when they are included in the ethnic problems, nevertheless study peoples and ethnic groups from some one aspect of their existence: The linguists investigate the various aspects of national languages, the folklore specialists—the oral creative work of the people, the sociologists—the data pertaining to their sphere of science, etc. There exists only one science for which the whole ethnic group (people, nation, nationality), its whole integrity, all of its sides (aspects, components) are important, necessary, interesting, and dear. This science is ethnography. Ethnography has accumulated the experience of the study of ethnic groups and developed various methods and technical devices for such work. It is extremely important to utilize this experience in the present difficult conditions.

The general and best method of its use is the creation of the GVES. It seems that its structure should consist of three basic items—the central Institute of Applied Ethnographic Research, regional centers for the same type of research, and—this is also very desirable—departmental [otraslevyye] (central and local) laboratories for applied ethnography. It is not ruled out, however, that in the future still another component of this system may come into existence—a State Ethnographer, that is a professional specialist, who possesses certain rights and who on behalf of the state controls the observance of the rights and interests of the peoples and ethnic groups in a concrete region.

It is necessary for all of the activity of the GVES to be built on a democratic basis. The widest circles of the scientific community and the creative intelligentsia, students of local lore, and all interested persons and institutions should be involved in its research and in the study of the draft proposals and solutions. Without this, it will hardly be possible to take into account the real needs and interests of the ethnic groups and peoples, and the operation of the GVES will prove to be substantially depreciated. Precisely on such a condition, the entire

future organization will, so to speak, be able to "keep a hand on the pulse," to know what is happening in inter-ethnic (inter-nationality) relations and how, how the intra-ethnic processes are developing, and to foresee the possible consequences of these or those government actions or government inaction.

As is well known, social objects can be controlled only with the assistance of control systems in whose composition qualified, trained, and competent workers play a decisive role. At the same time, it is becoming increasingly clear that such workers very often have to act in complex ethnic conditions, where special (technical, economic, etc.) knowledge alone proves to be inadequate. I will note, by the way, that complex ethnic conditions are encountered pretty often—large enterprises, construction sites, towns and settlements with collectives and a population that is complex in terms of ethnic (national) composition and population—these are typical objects of control. It is easy also to imagine another case, which is typical as well: A young engineer, administrator, agronomist, party or Komsomol official is appointed to work in a region with a different ethnic composition of inhabitants than his own ethnic membership. In both cases a distinct problem appears: What is to be done? Go or not go? If yes, then how to prepare for distinctive conditions? Where can one receive training for work in such conditions?

I answer: At the present time, it is impossible to receive training for this anywhere; there are neither courses, nor tekhnikums, nor VUZ's; the present-day experience is worthless. It appears, only in the Institute for Literature imeni A. M. Gorki, in the chair for translation, is there some experience in the training of translators from among Russians, Ukrainians, Belorussians, and others, who study the languages and the history of culture and literature together with students of other nationalities (Georgians, Mari, and others). We are trying, however, to imagine that we could give large contingents of young engineers, administrators, party and soviet officials, sufficiently solid language, ethnographic, and historical-cultural preparation. It is not difficult to guess that such workers and officials, as they say, would be priceless, especially in the conditions of the present shortage of personnel.

How to attain this, what proposals to submit to the government, on what forces to rely for support—the future GVES could be concerned with all of this.

Tasks of another class could consist in the following. Ethnic groups and peoples do not represent a homogeneous human mass, they have a complex social structure, including class, social-professional, and other stratification (stratum division). Of course, hardly anyone has the audacity to define precisely which composition of social-professional groups is optimal. Nevertheless, when we encounter hypertrophiedly developed groups of workers, engaged in unskilled, physical labor, or the weak development of a group, which is engaged in highly-skilled

mental labor, it is not too difficult to understand that in such cases we turn out to be far from the desired optimum. It is clear that an ethnic group with such a correlation of social and professional groups in its composition cannot actively join in the present-day scientific-technical revolution, utilize complex technologies, and develop science-intensive sectors of the national economy. Consequently, the governmental task of improving the social and professional structure of the ethnic group arises. This is one of the typical tasks of this sort. And here is another: If in a certain region with an ethnically-mixed population the personnel in the sphere of services belongs to one ethnic group, but the consumers of the services—to another, grounds for ethnic conflict may easily arise. With an ethnically homogeneous composition of the population, conflicts between the personnel and the consumers, naturally, are perceived as usual, everyday shortcomings in services; with an ethnically mixed composition of the population, they easily assume an inter-ethnic character, and to eliminate them, as the facts show, is exceedingly difficult. Is it not better to spend time, energy, and funds in order to study beforehand tasks of that sort and, on the basis of such study, to take preventive (precautionary) governmental measures?

I will name still another class of tasks which will hardly be seriously undertaken and solved without a GVES. I am speaking about propagandistic tasks. Inter-national education was in the past one of the favorite subjects. How many thick books were written, how many dissertations not needed by anyone were defended, and how many empty phrases were uttered! But in so doing, it was not taken into account that, in the interest of such education, it was necessary to eliminate our ethnographic illiteracy, to put an end to our ethnographic ignorance. How to realize this? It seems that we should introduce the study of the elements of ethnography in the secondary school and to expand its study in the institutions of higher education.

It also seems that the system of Marxist-Leninist education should be included in this work. Indeed, this is one of the tasks of the propagation and strengthening of internationalism in our society. There are elements for its solution already in the framework of the present course on problems of nationality relations. Especially significant is ethnographic training for party and soviet officials, the ideological aktiv, and propagandists; all of them, as a rule, in a multi-national environment. An important role in this could be played by the higher party schools, the universities of Marxism-Leninism, and the people's universities, in which a course on the foundations of ethnography should be introduced.

From everything that has been said, the reader may gain the impression (if, of course, he is in agreement with what is written above) that a GVES, in full scope, could be created already tomorrow—the CPSU Central Committee and the government have only to adopt an appropriate decree. Unfortunately, this is not so. We

must distinguish the potential possibilities of ethnography as a science (they are substantial and multi-faceted) and the practical forces of the present personnel corps of Soviet ethnographers (they are extremely small and do not have an identical orientation). There are about 1,000 to 1,200 (precise data are not available) professional ethnographers in the country (not counting museum workers, who have their own sphere of activity). For comparison: In the United States, there are approximately 10-12 times more specialists with an analogous profile, in Canada—6-8 times more, etc. Consequently, there are significantly more possibilities to receive an education in this specialty in the universities.

Of the indicated number of Soviet professional ethnographers, only about one-tenth are engaged in the development of the problems of the present and the applied aspects of the science. This, of course, is insufficient for the development of a GVES. For the full-fledged and effective work of a GVES, according to my estimates, 2,500 to 3,000 specialists are required. Meanwhile, to train the required number of qualified workers—this, too, is not an easy matter. In the country there are obviously few chairs of ethnography in the universities: They exist only at the universities of Moscow, Leningrad, Tbilisi, Kazan, and Omsk, and at the Kirghiz University (in Frunze). Chairs of ethnography should be created in Kiev, Minsk, Rostov, Yerevan, Novosibirsk, Alma-Ata, and a number of other university cities, where

there are cadres who are specialists. The chairs [kafedry] of ethnography at Moscow State University and Leningrad State University should be transformed into departments [otdeleniya] of ethnography and the contingents of students studying in them should be substantially increased. Given these conditions, we will be able to create, in the course of 8-10 years, an all-encompassing system, which will be capable, in collaboration with academic ethnography and the broad scientific community, of studying soundly and sensibly, on a solid scientific foundation, and proposing the best solutions for those problems which spring from the fact of living together in one union state of many peoples with their diverse cultures and specific interests.

With the new structure of the highest echelon of power in the country, where one of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet—the Council of Nationalities—is focusing its attention on the solution of the problem of inter-nationality relations, obviously, the question will arise about the organ that will directly prepare scientifically-scrutinized data for the chamber, the government, and all interested state and public institutions. The State All-Union Ethnographic Service, it seems to me, will be the best way of answering these new needs.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelo'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda".  
"Politicheskoye obrazovaniye", 1989.

**Immigration Office Proposed for Estonia**  
*18150078 Tallinn RAHVA HAAL in Estonian*  
*30 Apr 89 p 2*

[Editorial Report] Tallinn RAHVA HAAL in Estonian on 30 April, 1989 publishes on page 2 a 1,700-word article by Andres Kollist entitled "A Proposal to Create an Office of Immigration."

The article calls for uniform, state-wide, legally sanctioned guidelines to regulate immigration to Estonia. It also calls for legislation to be passed by the ESSR Supreme Soviet Presidium to support the creation of an office of immigration.

Such legislation should: specify the basic functions of the office; appoint a head for such an office, who would be given the rights of a minister of the Estonian SSR; and establish a firm immigration quota, not to be exceeded by the Council of Ministers.

Tentative suggestions offered in the article include setting annual limits based on a given percentage of the permanent population. The Council of Ministers would then determine the categorical mix for that number by setting up sub-quotas for different countries and categories such as labor, specialized personnel, retired servicemen and others. The article also suggests that all such quotas and other regulative policies be disclosed and open to the public.

The article includes a review of immigration limits enforced by other countries, showing Finland at less than 0.01 percent of the population, the German UR at 0.007 percent, and USA at 0.04 percent (with a quarter of that number allotted to immigrants from the Soviet Union alone).

The author finds a limit of 0.1 percent of population, for example, quite generous for Estonia, translating to approximately 1,500 immigrants a year. As it stands, the article points out, 3,200 people were admitted to the republic last year (1988) alone.

The immigration office, as proposed, would be the only agency empowered to initiate and approve local registration and housing applications. It would also work with temporary residents and help them with obtaining permanent papers or citizenship.

The author reports that ideas presented in his article are currently being drafted into a constitution for the Estonian SSR Office of Immigration by Arvo Junt. He also maintains that the article was published with the express purpose of generating popular support or further discussion on this matter.

**Birth Rate Up For Estonians; Majority Margin Still Threatened**  
*18150080*

[Editorial Report] Tallinn RAHVA HAAL in Estonian on 2 June 1989, publishes on page 3 a 2,100-word article entitled "What's To Become of Us?" by Ene Tiit. The article examines population growth figures for indigenous Estonians and those of other nationalities living in Estonia and finds the future of the native majority margin still threatened by immigration.

The findings are based on a table of annual birth and death figures going back to 1960, as well as immigration and emigration totals for the same period. Additional demographic data is used to interpret the material. The terms "native" or "Estonian-national birth", as used in the article, refer to children born to Estonian mothers.

The article reports a natural population growth of 6,509 and an immigration balance of 3,200 people for the year of 1988, adding up to almost 10,000 in total population growth for the country. This is put in context as follows:

"Considering the fact that 15,210 Estonians were born, and 13,261 Estonians departed permanently, the natural population growth for Estonians stands at 1,949 people. Even this number is relatively large—over the last 10 years the average population growth for Estonians has been under 1,000 people a year—in some years even negative. Even so, the population growth of Estonians accounts for barely one fifth of the total growth of Estonia's population, since there are very few Estonians among the immigrants.

"Simple arithmetic shows that children born to other-nationals living in Estonia numbered 9,850 in 1988 (last year's total was 10,278), but since there were only 5,290 incidents of death among non-Estonians (5,125 last year), the natural population growth among other-nationals was 4,560 people, or 2.34 times larger than the natural population growth of Estonians. A year ago, the natural population growth of other-nationals was up to 3.12 times that of Estonians, but over the seven-year period (1982 through 1988) the natural population growth of Estonians accounted barely for 15 percent of the total natural population growth of Estonia.

Among reasons for the lower rate of natural population growth for Estonians, the article cites the relatively high mortality rates for infants and adult males, and a higher percentage of seniors:

"Based on 1985 data, it was estimated that from those over 60, 72 percent were Estonians, while the total population figures showed only a 61 percent portion of Estonians."

The article points out, however, that these differences in age distribution are beginning to level off. It remarks:

"The first wave of young immigrants from the post-war period has already reached retirement age and, year by year, their mortality ratio has been approaching that of the entire population. This indicates a trend toward a more uniform age distribution between the two ethnic groups.

"This difference in age distribution between the two ethnic groups has also accounted for the fact that Estonian nationals make up roughly 60 percent of the total population, but only 55 percent of the population of childbearing women (and men of the same age).

"Based on the foregoing, one should note that the relative number of children born to Estonian mothers during 1988 was not 55 percent (as might be expected based on the national distribution of women of childbearing age), but close to 61 percent. Also significant is the fact that, beginning in 1982, the number of Estonian-national children has increased in both absolute and relative numbers, and that the generation of Estonian daughters outnumbers the generation of mothers."

The article explains:

"The birth activity of Estonian women is somewhat higher than that of other nationals living in Estonia, and complaints about the population growth of Estonians being low because of a low birth rate are not warranted."

To increase the odds of maintaining a native majority margin for the country, the article suggests better health maintenance for men to reduce their mortality rate and bring up the number of available marriage partners. That this is indeed possible, the article notes, "is shown by the drop in the mortality rate for 1986, the year following the infamous dry law!"

The article states that some 200,000 immigrants, predominantly other-nationals, have settled in Estonia during the period studied (since 1960). It also states that, due to natural population growth, the number of other-nationals has increased by 127,600, or "almost doubled", while the number of Estonians grew by 34,400 over the same period." The observation continues:

"Looking at the table, one will notice that all demographic indicators for other-nationals, in both their absolute and relative values, are growing fast. In contrast, all demographic processes among the Estonian population have remained on the same level, more or less. The only thing that stands out is the increase in the mortality rate by roughly 20 percent."

Special concern was expressed in the article about the capital city of Tallinn and its environs, where births of other-nationals outnumber those of Estonians. The birth figures listed for 1988 showed 3,529 Estonians out of a

total of 7,721 or 45.7 percent for the city including the Maardu and Saue areas. Not counting the extra areas, the percentage of Estonians among Tallinn's newborn is 47.1.

With the prospects for a national majority still hanging in the balance, immigration is cited as the determining factor for the future. The article says:

"If we manage to change the immigration balance to zero, and if the slightly higher fertility of Estonian women continues, then there's still hope for maintaining a 60 percent majority of Estonians. Should the immigration continue, however—even at the 1988 level—or if current deviations in demographic behavior should change because of imprudent family policies (such as preferential housing allocations or material incentives for stimulating the birth rate), then all hope for maintaining a numerical majority of Estonians in their ancient homeland will disappear."

The article concludes:

... "Over the last 10 years, the birth rate curve of Estonians has been characterized by a steady growing trend, the main causes of which have been a relatively numerous generation of mothers (early 60's) on one hand, and a conscious desire to survive as Estonians, on the other."

**Eighth Session of Mossovet Concluded**  
*18001062 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA*  
*in Russian 16 Apr 89 p 1*

[Unattributed report: "More Attention to the Needs of Muscovites, 8th Session, 20th Convocation of the Moscow City Soviet of Peoples Deputies"]

[Text] The eighth session, 20th convocation of the Mossovet [Moscow City Soviet of Worker's Deputies] took place yesterday at the MGK [Moscow City Committee] and CPSU MK [Ministry of Culture] House of Political Education.

Deputy V.T. Saykin, chairman of the Mossovet ispolkom [executive committee] opened the session.

V.P. Shantsev, first secretary of the Perovski CPSU RK [Rayon Committee], was elected chairman of the session. Deputy T.A. Churbanova, deputy department chief of the Radio Technical Institute imeni Academician A.L. Minets was elected secretary.

The session agenda was firmly established:

1. Report on work of the 20th Convocation of the Moscow Municipal Soviet of Peoples Deputies executive committee for 1987-1989.
2. On certain urgent measures for regulating trade in the city of Moscow.

3. On the course of carrying out the decisions of the Council of the 20th Convocation (5th Session)—on the inquiry of Deputies T.V. Gretskeya, L.G. Rubtsova, and L.A. Zharebtsov directed to the Main Public Health Administration and the Frunze district soviet ispolkom and also on the inquiry to L.V. Vavakin, head of Glavmosarkhitektura [Main Administration of Architecture] of the Mossovet permanent commission on physical education and sports, and comrade B.V. Selivanov, head of the Single Client Association of Mosstroykomitet [Moscow State Construction and Installation Trust Commission].

#### 4. Organizational issues.

V.T. Saykin, chairman of the Mossovet ispolkom, delivered a report on the first question on the agenda. A.L. Lisitsyn, chairman of the Mossovet permanent commission for transport and communications, delivered a supplementary report.

The following people participated in the discussion of the report, the supplementary report, and the draft decision on the Mossovet ispolkom report: A.P. Timofeyev, chairman of the Kuybyshev district soviet ispolkom, V.A. Soldatenkov department head of the M.E. Korotkov Scientific Research Institute and deputy chief engineer and chief technologist of the scientific research institute; L.V. Bureva, director of the Red Guards Meat Processing Plant V.N. Belyayev, lathe operator at a machine building plant; V.M. Chepkin, general director of a machine building plant; A.K. Bolshova, main state arbitrator of State Arbitration in the city of Moscow; L.N. Nikolayev, first secretary of the Solntsevo CPSU RK; V.M. Filippov, doctor of physics and mathematical sciences and professor at the Friendship of Peoples University imeni Patrice Lumumba; A.N. Solovov, chief doctor of municipal clinical hospital No 6; N.V. Chigarentsev, chairman of the board of the municipal society of invalids; O.M. Savostyuk, chairman of the board of the Moscow organization of the RSFSR Union of Artists; Yu. A. Prokofev, second secretary of the CPSU MGK; V.M. Kopylov, head of the NII [Scientific Research Institute] laboratory; P.S. Bogdanov, deputy minister of Internal Affairs of the USSR and head of the Mosgorispolkom GUVK [Main Administration of Internal Affairs]; L. V. Burkina, chairman of the commission on public self-administration of the Arbat micro-district; S.S. Zimin, department chief of the scientific research institute; Ye.Yu. Gonchareva, teacher at middle boarding school No 60; F.F. Kosmos, deputy chairman of the veterans soviet in Dzerzhinskiy rayon; G.I. Bychenkov, Voroshilov RK Komsomol worker.

V.A. Zharov, head of Glavmostorgbyit [Main Administration for Trade and Domestic Services] and deputy chairman of the Mossovet ispolkom reported on certain urgent measures for regulating trade in Moscow.

The decisions presented were adopted after examination of the issues.

In accordance with a permanent commission report on public health care, the soviet closed the completed inquiry of Deputies T.V. Gretskeya, L. G. Rubtsovaya, and L.A. Zharebtsov which was addressed to the Main Public Health Administration and the Frunze district soviet ispolkom. The permanent commission also closed the completed inquiry on physical education and sports addressed to the Association of United Clients of Mosstroykomitet.

Organizational issues were reviewed at the session.

The soviet formed a state intra-departmental projects administration of experts.

The soviet eliminated the administrative and technical inspection administration under the Mosgorispolkom and relieved B.S. Kozyritskiy, chairman of this administration, of his duties. The Mossovet ispolkom named him head of the administrative and technical inspection cost accounting association. The soviet relieved Deputy V.N. Mudrak, head of the Mosgorispolkom Main Public Health Administration, of his duties in connection with his transfer to other duties. Deputy A.M. Moskvichev was confirmed as head of the Main Administration. Deputy L.N. Oborkina was confirmed as head of the Mosgorispolkom Main Monitoring and Audit Administration. Deputy V.N. Voronenko was confirmed as manager of the Mossovet ispolkom. A.L. Voronin was confirmed as head of the state inter-departmental projects administration of experts under the Mosgorispolkom. Yu.V. Gorbatoev was confirmed as head of the Mosgorispolkom administration for servicing inter-departmental organizations.

Deputy A.M. Moskvichev was relieved of his duties as chairman of the Mossovet permanent public health commission. The soviet elected Deputy Ye.G. Sologubov chairman of this commission. The soviet relieved Ya.M. Lutskiy of his duties as chairman of the Mossovet permanent social welfare commission and elected O.P. Yatseva as chairman of this commission. O.R. Mikhaylova was relieved of her duties as state arbitrator of State Arbitration for the city of Moscow in connection with her transfer to other duties.

The soviet relieved a number of Moscow Municipal Court members from their duties ahead of schedule. The soviet elected 19 peoples judges of rayon peoples courts to replace those relieved.

In accordance with a Credentials Commission report, the powers were revoked of Deputies N.I. Murikovaya, for health reasons, and G.I. Sharovaya, at personal request.

The soviet decided to convene the next, ninth session in June of this year.

Responsible officials of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR and RSFSR Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, the USSR and RSFSR Councils of Ministers, officials of a number of ministries and departments, and also leaders of rayon soviet ispolkoms, chairmen of district soviet permanent commissions, groups of territorial deputies, and public soviets and residential self-government commissions took part in the session's work.

### **Professional Soccer Club Founded**

*18001078a Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA  
in Russian 29 Apr 89 p 4*

[Report by the Zenit Soccer Club Organizing Committee: "The Zenit Soccer Club—A Reality"]

[Excerpt] In accordance with the USSR Council of Ministers, VTsPS [All-Union Central Trade Union Council], and the Komsomol Central Committee 1988 resolution "On Improvement of the Management of Soccer, and Other Game Type Sports and Additional Measures for the Composition of Teams and Sportsmen in the Basic Types of Sports," the Zenit Soccer Club is being established on a cost accounting basis. The Optical-Mechanical Association imeni V.I. Lenin, the Leningrad Oblast Council of Trade Unions, and the oblpotrebsoyuz [Oblast Consumers Union] are its organizers and founders.

They are proposing to gradually transition the club to self-financing. The organizers and founders, and it is hoped, other enterprises, organizations, cooperatives, and also rank and file soccer fans will take part in forming the charter fund. The main sources of financing are income from ticket sales, and individual and collective contributions from club members.

They are proposing to assist in the development of children and youth soccer in Leningrad and the oblast and in establishment of a modern reserve training base once the club's material and financial base has been consolidated. Since profits from ticket sales are the main source for formation of the soccer players salary fund, transmission on local television will be in accordance with the club's terms. As the experience of other cost accounting clubs shows, direct transmission is only possible when 80 percent of the stadium's tickets are sold.

Player and trainer relations with the club are based on a labor contract which has been concluded for a specific time period.

Accommodations are needed for the soccer club. A mass public organization is being created, a soccer fan club, which anyone wishing to can join under individual or collective membership terms. The annual individual membership contribution is two rubles for college students, students, officer candidates, and pensioners, and it is ten rubles for all others. Club members have the

right to visit the club's video recording equipment, meet with players and trainers, and acquire soccer souvenirs and reduced price season tickets in the best seats.

For joining the club, you need to send the sum indicated above by mail to account No 26000302053 MFO 171188 in the Kalinin branch of the Leningrad Promstroybank [Industrial Construction Bank] and send the contribution payment receipt to the orgkomitet [organizing committee], a personal statement about joining the club indicating full name and patronymic, age, type of employment and home address, as well as two 3 by 4 photographs and a self-addressed envelope. A membership ticket, which the organizing committee will send you in a month's time, is proof of club membership. Collective contributions are determined by mutual agreement. The management organs will be formed by 1 July 1989. The club is taking out a patent on its symbol and trademark.

[Passage omitted]

### **Siberian Culture Center Opens**

*18001078b Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA  
in Russian 17 May 89 First Edition p 2*

[Article by A. Kostyakov, Leningrad University student: "Siberians on the Banks of the Neva"]

[Text] The Siberian Cultural Center was ceremoniously opened in Leningrad. The All-Union Conference on "Problems of Revival and Development of the Cultural and Economic Complex of Native Siberian Peoples" began operating within it.

"The Siberian Cultural Center," says I. Chistanov, who is fulfilling the duties as director, "united the representatives of 33 Siberian native peoples. Envoys from minor nationalities of the Extreme North and Far East also took part."

During the first stage, the center's activities will be directed at collecting information from the nationalities homelands and analyzing the Siberian native population's living conditions.

"Unfortunately, the majority of the information gathered has a negative tint," N. Bulatova, candidate of philological sciences and scientific associate of the Leningrad branch of the Institute of Linguistics AN [Academy of Science] USSR, continues the conversation. "It has been extremely difficult, especially recently, to establish mutual relations between civilization and the majority of the nationalities of the North, which are small in numbers. I am of the Evenk nationality and have frequently visited our national areas. It is painful to see how the proud hunters and reindeer breeders are being deprived of the customary ways of the olden days and their children are losing their native language."

"Why exactly was the Siberian Cultural Center established in Leningrad and not in one of the major university cities of Siberia?"

"For more than a century, Peterburg-Leningrad was a sort of scientific, cultural, and enlightenment center for the Siberian people," says I. Chistanov. "After the Great October Revolution, hundreds of representatives of the Siberian peoples studied in Leningrad. In 1930, The Institute of the Peoples of the North was opened here. Right now, Siberian peoples ethnography and linguistics departments are operating in Leningrad's academic institutions. There is a department of Peoples of the Extreme North in the Pedagogical Institute imeni Gertsen.

### **Railroad Workers Protect Lake**

18001078c Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 18 May 89 Second Edition p 2

[Report by B. Plotkin: "They Are Protecting the Lake"]

[Text] Chita—The Kalarskiy rayon executive committee decided to make the Northern Baykal Department of BAM [Baykal-Amur Railroad Trunk Line] manager of ancient Lake Nichatok located in the North of Transbaykal.

Worried about the fate of this unique reservoir still rich with valuable species of fish, the railroad workers decided to wisely and thriftily use this invaluable gift of nature: to organize permanent conservation of the lake and the lakeside forest areas and to regulate the fishing industry.

### **Massive Food Poisoning Reported in Vinnitsa Oblast**

18001155a Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 7 May 89 p 3

[Article by A. Gorobets: "How Are Things in Shargorod?"]

[Text] The beginning of May was an alarming time for many residents of Vinnitsa. As we already reported, the confectioners of the Shargorod foodstuffs plant handed them a bitter pill for the holiday. Their "sweet products" set into action practically all the antiepidemic services of the oblast and the republic's capital and sent about 500 citizens to the hospitals of Shargorod, Zhmerinka, and Vinnitsa with a serious illness. Alas, they were not able to save 5-year-old Lilya Basistaya.

How are things in Shargorod today?

Yesterday we communicated by telephone with T.D. Bachinskaya, chairman of the emergency operations group for the elimination of the consequences of the mass poisoning of citizens, and deputy chairman of the oblispolkom. This is what she told us:

"In general the situation is returning to normal. As of 1300 on 6 May, 144 people have been discharged from the hospital. The people returning home will remain under medical supervision on an outpatient basis.

"It is already possible to make initial conclusions about the reasons for the mass food poisoning. It happened as a result of gross violations of sanitary standards and technology for the production of confectionery. As was presumed, the stimulus for the toxic effect was the *Salmonella bacillus* from chicken eggs purchased from the population. But the chickens should not be blamed; it was the fault of those who condoned the terrible lack of sanitation in production and, by their inactivity, contributed to the emergency situation.

"As you already reported, criminal proceedings have been instituted. Yesterday comrade Beygel', director of the foodstuffs plant, and comrade Klapoukh, chief of the confectionery shop, were relieved of their duties by decision of the work collective of the rayon consumers' union. Today the emergency operations group, in its own session, gave a vote of no confidence to comrade Kravets, chairman of the rayon consumers' union. Next in turn is an examination of the work of the rayon's sanitary and epidemiologic services."

And how are the people who found themselves in the role of "hostages of the cooks"? This is what A.S. Manachin, chief of the health department of the oblispolkom, said on the subject:

"The physicians have done and are doing everything necessary to return the situation to normal. The majority of the patients are getting ready to be discharged. It helped that we were able to organize efficiently all the necessary means to save the people. As the tests showed, we were dealing with group "D" *Salmonella*. We believe that there will not be any lasting effects after the course of treatment. As for fatalities, we will have to examine the causes carefully."

### **BSSR Supreme Soviet Examines Progress in Belorussian Language Study**

18001155b Minsk SELSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 23 May 89 p 3

[Unattributed report under the rubric "In the Permanent Commissions of the BSSR Supreme Soviet": "With Concern for the Native Language"]

[Text] What have the BSSR ministries of public education and culture accomplished on the development and advancement of the role of the Belorussian language in the public life of the republic? This was the subject of a regular session of the Permanent Commission on Nationalities Questions and Interethnic Relations of the BSSR Supreme Soviet. Deputies visited those offices, as well as the directorates of public education of the Minsk oblispolkom and gorispolkom, the department of public education of the Soligorskiy rayispolkom, the BSSR



Goskomizdat [State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, the Book Trade], the BGU [Belorussian State University] imeni V.I. Lenin, and the Minsk State Pedagogical Institute imeni A.M. Gor'kiy. They were interested in a specific issue: How goes the development of the republic's "Native Language" and "Heritage" programs, to be implemented by the ministries jointly with the Belorussian Cultural Foundation and the BSSR Academy of Sciences?

It turned out—and it was noted at the session—that these sections are functioning independently, and that no one is coordinating the work. As before, important problems remain in the development of Belorussian-Russian bilingualism, and their practical solution has been slow. It was emphasized that, while preserving the principle of bilingualism in the republic, it is necessary to improve the study and use of Belorussian in every way possible, and to create the conditions for its elevation to the status of a state language.

The "Yunatsva," "Narodnaya Asveta," and "Vysheysheya Shkola" publishing houses do not satisfy the schools' demands for the publication of literature in Belorussian, especially popular literature and literature on the history of the BSSR. In the opinion of the speakers, television can also offer teachers of Belorussian invaluable assistance if it organizes a program of teaching materials and instructional films in the near future. The advancement of the role of Belorussian in public life: This also means its expanded use in the republic's kindergartens, schools, and VUZ's.

Members of the commission decided to submit this issue to a session of the Presidium of the BSSR Supreme Soviet. The creation in the Supreme Soviet of a commission or group for the preparation of the appropriate legislative acts was deemed advisable. The BSSR ministries of public education and culture jointly with the Academy of Sciences and the Belorussian Cultural Foundation have been instructed to coordinate the development and implementation of the republic's programs on language and historical and cultural heritage. It was recommended that the number of hours spent on the study of Belorussian language and literature in VUZ's and general education schools be increased; that preparation be started for a gradual transition to a program of instruction in Belorussian at liberal arts VUZ's, technical secondary schools, and primary-school teachers' training colleges; and that preparation and retraining of teachers of Belorussian language classes and schools and educators at child welfare institutions be broadened in specially organized courses.

The issue of the use of Belorussian on street signs was also examined at the commission's session.

V.A. Mikulich, deputy chairman of the Presidium of the BSSR Supreme Soviet, and L.N. Syroyegina, secretary of the Presidium of the BSSR Supreme Soviet, also participated in the work of the commission.

**Symbolism of Ukrainian National Flag Argued**  
*18001349 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian*  
2 Jun 89 p 3

[Article by Ye. Kravchenko: "Whose Symbolism?"]

[Text] Let me begin by telling you a funny story. The Lesser Antilles Islands, which are in the Atlantic Ocean, include the island of Barbados with an area of 430 square meters, occupied by a state of the same name. Ringed by storybook coral reefs, thousand-year-old sandstone and fabulous beaches, for a long time Barbados was called "Little England." The origin of this name stems from the fact that from the mid-17th century to 30 November 1966, the administration of Barbados was concentrated in the hands of an English governor. It was a *de facto* and *de jure* colony of Great Britain. And then suddenly after Barbados emerged from the British yoke, Canadian Professor Yaroslav Rudnitskiy (presently deceased) began calling this island state "Little Ukraine."

What happened? Could it be that a Ukrainian settlement was discovered on Barbados? Or perhaps the Barbadians, over 70 percent of whom are of African origin, proclaimed themselves to be Ukrainians, and a part of the Ukrainian people?

Nothing of the sort, explained the professor in the Munich journal SUCHASNIST (No 4, 1967). Rudnitskiy decided to name this Caribbean country thus, because of its national and state symbols, a yellow-and-blue flag with a trident in its upper corner. The first thing that numerous passengers saw at the airport in Bridgetown, the capital of Barbados, in December 1966 was these same flags, and identically colored pins and cockades on men's caps and hair ribbons worn by the black-skinned beauties of Barbados. America's Esso distributed such cockades to all of the capital's taxi drivers. Even champagne bottles were decorated by yellow-and-blue labels bearing a trident. Two-color shoestrings decorated the footwear of Barbadians.

"As a result we confirmed," Ya. Rudnitskiy from Canada concludes this picture, "that it is only purely historical chance that the colors and state seal of the Ukraine (?) coincide with those of Barbados."

What kind of coincidence was he talking about? It is known to every more or less educated person, after all, that the Ukrainian SSR's red- and-azure flag and the yellow-and-blue flag of Barbados wave beside the United Nations building in New York. It must be that the deceased professor had in mind some other Ukraine, one not existing on geographic maps, since he did not recognize a Soviet Ukraine. There is something else that is obvious from this article as well. It would seem that the professor, and incidentally a few thousand surviving Nazi war criminals among the Ukrainian nationalists abroad as well, wanted to return to Ukrainian soil, the past of the yellow-and-blue symbol of the Kaiser's Germany, and then Nazi Germany, bordered by a swastika

and a trident. The same malevolent past with its fascist bloody genocide, with nationalistic assassins from "Nachtigall" and "Roland," the SS Galician division and the German-Ukrainian police.

By the way, the Johnny-come-lately fans of "national traditions" prefer to avoid with silence the period of the yellow-and-blue flag and trident associated with activities of Ukrainian nationalists in World War II. Instead of this, they seek their roots among the princes of Kievan Ancient Russia Vladimir and Yaroslav, while some of them even seek these roots in Oleg, even though archeological confirmations of their devotion to the symbols of the yellow-and-blue does not exist. Assertions are made in parallel as to the Scandinavian origin of these symbols, leading the uninformed to the notion that the Ukrainians are of Norman origin, and that the three fraternal peoples—Ukrainian, Belorussian and Russian—do not possess common roots.

In my opinion all of these operations, proponents of which have made their existence known recently in our republic as well, have as their goal not the accelerated and real solution of the problems that accumulated in the Ukrainian SSR in the area of national relations during the years of Stalinism and Brezhnevian stagnation, but exactly the opposite—to distract us from what is most important—that is, from participation in perestroika, to prod the people into fruitless and empty debate.

But the main thing is that the Ukrainian people had already selected the red-and-azure flag as their state symbol long ago, and that beneath this flag they have taken on the job of surmounting the distortions and encumbrances which they inherited from the times when Lenin's principles of nationality policy were grossly violated in our country and the undoubtable accomplishments of the 1920s were cancelled out.

The truth is that people capable of envisioning the root cause of all problems and the primary basis for their solution in colors are attempting to persuade us that the Ukrainian people had supposedly chosen the yellow-and-blue flag as their state symbol. This was done, they say, in the period of the Central Rada under the lead of M. Grushevskiy. And in fact, in March 1918 the government of the Ukrainian National Republic did adopt the corresponding decision. But who gave it the authority to do so? In whose name was this done? Had they asked the opinion of our grandfathers and great-grandfathers on this issue?

Here is what the facts say. Petlyura's troops, which by the way never numbered more than 30,000-40,000 men, entered Kiev in late February and early March 1918 exclusively owing to intervention by German troops invited into the Ukraine by the UNR [Ukrainian National Republic] government. Here is what I. Maystrenko, a representative of foreign "Ukrainian studies" and a person with sympathies far divorced from the Ukrainian SSR, wrote in the article "Pages From the

History of the Communist Party of the Ukraine" (SUCHASNIST, No 4, 1965): "The UNR government concluded a peace treaty in Brest with Austro-Germany on the basis of which German troops were invited into the Ukraine to help the Central Rada.... But the invitation of the Germans to the Ukraine also meant self-liquidation of the UNR. On 29 April 1918 the headquarters of the German troops organized a revolution in Kiev, in the course of which the Central Rada was disbanded."

It does not take a lot of wisdom to understand that the Ukrainian people had not invited the Germans in. As far as the Ukraine was concerned, the latter were interested not in ludicrous debates over the colors of a flag but in something more prosaic—coal, iron ore, pig iron, grain and sugar.

The following is clear as well: When it invited the Germans into the Ukraine, the Central Rada was not concerned with the colors of the flag, or with the interests of restoring Ukrainian statehood and liquidated czarism, or with longings for the people's national identity either. It was concerned more with something greater: preserving its own ambitions, halting the victorious advance of Soviet power, and preventing a situation where the struggle against forces of the past on Ukrainian soil would be fought under the banners of the brotherhood of peoples inhabiting the Russian state. It is indicative that among its first acts and decrees of spring-fall 1917, the Central Rada openly proclaimed its complete obedience to the Petrograd Provisionary Government, and reserved for the Ukraine the role of an autonomous formation within the framework of a capitalist Russia. And it was only with establishment of Soviet rule that a big thing was made of the "independence" thesis.

It stands to reason that leaders of the UNR harbored doubts, and that they preferred to hold all power through their own means. But history does not recognize any "what ifs"; in distinction from grammar, history does not have a subjunctive mood. What really happened is this. A week before its ignoble disappearance, in late April 1918 the Central Rada concluded a treaty (agreement) with Germany in accordance with which the Ukraine was to send 60 million poods of grain and an enormous quantity of other food and raw materials to Germany as payment for its intervention. In the meantime the hetmans brought to power by the invaders were prepared to pay for the occupation by deliveries of as many as 75 million poods of grain, 11 million poods of cattle in live weight, 4 million poods of sugar and so on. And this was at a time when millions of laborers in the Ukraine were living in cold and hunger, and were suffering poverty under the German occupation.

Only the Bolsheviks stated real concern for such a situation. It was noted during the first congress of the Ukrainian Communist Party (of Bolsheviks) in a resolution titled "On the Current Moment" that: "The objective situation created by the world war and by economic

and geographic conditions on one hand and the desire to suffocate the Russian Socialist Republic on the other are prodding the Central European imperialist group ever eastward, motivated by the occupation of not only the Ukraine but also regions east of it.... All of this is motivating the imperialists to attack the Ukraine...."

In view of the foreign threat, which did not frighten the zheltoblakitniki, in accordance with the situation the congress made the sole correct conclusion, that "Ukrainian independence is impossible under the conditions of the present world economy," and its inclusion in the overall system of the world economy would be possible either through its imperialistic absorption, with the open cooperation of counterrevolutionary classes of the Ukraine itself, one of the powerful centers of financial capital, or by establishing, by way of proletarian revolution, a socialist association together with all of the existing and future Soviet republics."

If we consider the "what if's," then the actions of the Central Rada were what provided the sole possibility for Ukrainians to fight the external and internal counterrevolution together with the Russian people and to subsequently join the Union of Soviet Republics. Chiefly in view of the foreign threat, other variants were excluded despite the calls for independence by different strata of the Ukrainian population. Yu. Bachinskiy, one of the officials of the UNR, later wrote the following on the topic of "variants": "Only in the event of direct assistance from one of the warring sides—the Central Powers or the Entente—would it have been possible, though artificially, to support the Ukrainian state, despite its sabotage by the Ukrainian masses." (Author's emphasis.)

Thus the Ukrainian people selected socialism and their own new symbolism. Being perhaps a self-critical person, M. Grushevskiy himself recognized by as early as in Geneva on 16 December 1919 that the Ukrainian peasants, who were the foundation of the working population, "were against plans for returning the old orders, against the police and the gendarmerie, against the landowners." There is no need to belabor the point that the working class supported the bolsheviks almost unanimously. As far as the intelligentsia was concerned, even K. Vishevich, a representative of the Black Four-Hundred, complained then that the zheltoblakitniki suffered somewhat by the "absence of a more or less sizable number of Ukrainian intelligentsia on their side." The reluctance of peasants, technicians and creative intelligentsia of the Ukraine to join the yellow-and-blues was to be written about many years later by one of the organizers of Petlyura's military formations, Yu. Artyushenko.

Nor do attempts by certain supporters of the symbolism of the yellow and blues toblakitniki and of the trident to explain the fiasco of Ukrainian nationalism during the revolution exclusively by help rendered to the Ukrainian Russian Bolsheviks withstand any sort of comparison with the historical facts. Who would know this for

certain if not V. Vinnichenko, who replaced M. Grushevskiy as leader of the UNR? And here is what he wrote in his principal work, "Vozrozhdeniye natsii" [The Rebirth of Nations]: "We transferred all of the blame to Russian Bolsheviks: It is they, we say, who marched on the Ukraine with their troops, and whipped us.... It must be stated sincerely and openly that had our own peasantry not rebelled against us, the Russian Soviet government would not have been able to do anything against us.... And it was not the Russian government but our own people who banished us."

Thus most of the Ukrainian people also expressed their attitude toward the symbolism professed by the founders of the UNR. "Had there not been an uprising," wrote V. Vinnichenko. Let me repeat myself. History is oblivious to any kind of "what if's," it is oblivious to the subjunctive mood. It may be found useful only to those who might wish to tailor the past to their own ambitions, who might wish to rehabilitate Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists, and forget their atrocious crimes on Ukrainian soil during the Great Patriotic War and in the postwar years. But the symbolism under which all of this went on is another subject.

#### **Ukrainian Academics, Writers Participate in New York Conference**

18001052a Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian  
4 Apr 89 p 3

[Report by RATAU correspondent N. Maslov: "The Shevchenko Conference"]

[Text] New York—The ninth scholarly Shevchenko conference, dedicated to the 175th anniversary of the great bard's birth, has been held at New York University. The following guests from the Ukraine took part in it and delivered reports: Doctor of Philology Nikolay Zhulinskiy, deputy director of the Ukraine SSR Academy of Sciences; T. G. Shevchenko Institute of Literature; and writers and commentators Ivan Dzyuba and Raisa Ivanchenko. The following researchers spoke at the conference on the American side: Yuriy Shevelev of Columbia University; Ivan Fizer of Rutgers; Omelyan Pritsak and Yuriy Grabovich of Harvard; and Leonid Rudnitskiy of La Salle University.

Previous conferences were not always so extensive in scope. A certain proportionality was evident in the representation of U.S. and Ukrainian scholars at the conference, observed Yuriy Grabovich, professor at Harvard University's Ukrainian Research Institute, in a conversation with a correspondent for the Ukrainian Telegraph Agency. It is essential to have such living contact constantly. But I would like to see these Shevchenko conferences introduce new concepts, even a new methodology, and new approaches. I believe that we very much need joint intensive scholarly symposiums, conferences, and colloquiums.

For Ukrainians of American extraction, it is essential that ties with the Ukraine continue and become an inevitable phenomenon. Ideological and political barriers have caused us great harm. But now, since we are concerned with Ukrainian culture together, we need to cooperate. I take a very optimistic view of the future. For the restructuring under way in your country is exerting a great influence not only on relations between the two great powers. It is of general, universal, and worldwide benefit, Yuriy Grabovich stressed.

#### **League of Ukrainian Americans 65th Anniversary Noted**

18001052b Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian  
29 Apr 89 p 3

[RATAU report: "League of Ukrainian Americans 65th Anniversary"]

[Text] New York—The League of Ukrainian Americans, a progressive U.S. public organization, has celebrated its 65th anniversary. A ceremony marking the occasion brought together league activists, guests from various cities in the United States, representatives of fraternal national organizations, and officials of the Ukrainian SSR's Permanent Mission to the United Nations and its Secretariat.

The League of Ukrainian Americans has always been part of America's popular mass movement for social equality and justice and for the interests of the country's working class, said Mikhail Ganusyak, editor of the newspaper Ukrayinski visti and executive secretary of the league's council, in opening the meeting.

In a speech at the meeting, Dzhuliya Bondar, the league's president, observed that the League of Ukrainian Americans has a rich and full history. Last year the league held its 27th convention, which discussed its subsequent activities. The resolutions that were approved stressed the importance of broadening fraternal ties with the Ukraine.

M. Lagoyda, a former executive secretary of the league's board and honorary editor of the Lemko Association's newspaper Karpatska Rus, recalled the history of the democratic movement in the United States and the involvement of the progressive Ukrainian emigre community in it.

Pavel Vetrov, editor of the newspaper Russkiy golos, offered congratulations to the league's members, as did Zoltan Dik, editor of the newspaper Magyar Szo, and Ameliya Yushkevich, secretary of the board of the U.S. Association of Lithuanian Workers. The meeting's participants reacted with friendly applause to a greeting received from the Ukraina Society.

#### **Armenian Refugees in AzSSR To Receive Grants** 18300754 Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian 12 Jul 89 p 3

[Azerinform report: "For the Information of Citizens Who Left Armenia as a Result of the Mass Migration"]

[Editorial Report] Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian on 12 July 1989 carries on page 3 a 500-word Azerinform report titled "For the Information of Citizens Who Left Armenia as a Result of the Mass Migration." The report announces that a one-time grant equivalent to three months' salary will be paid from Armenian government funds to refugees from Armenia. Refugees are instructed to contact their former places of employment in order to receive their grants.

#### **AzSSR CC Discusses Resettlement of Armenian Refugees**

18300710 Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian  
7 Jun 89 p 2

[Azerinform report: "In the Azerbaijan CP Central Committee"]

[Text] A conference was held at the Azerbaijan CP Central Committee of officials of all relevant republic ministries, departments, party and soviet organs on progress in fulfilling the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers decree "On Measures for Developing the Altyagach-Khyzysinskaya Zone of Apsheronkiy Rayon," which calls for relocating into that territory the yet unsettled segment of the inhabitants who left their places of permanent residence in the the Armenian SSR and are temporarily located in the cities of Baku and Sumgait and in Apsheronkiy Rayon.

S. N. Murtuzayev, first secretary of the Apsheronkiy raykom, reported on the course of the decree's implementation.

It was noted that, since the decree's adoption, a certain amount of preparatory work has been performed to implement certain of its provisions. On the whole, however, republic ministries and departments have approached the government decree's fulfillment without a sense of proper responsibility, are losing time gearing up, and are getting work under way at a slow pace. Citing a lack of funds and materials and other subjective factors, they have essentially jeopardized the timely construction and commissioning of residential buildings, social, cultural, and consumer-service facilities, roads, and utilities for those to be resettled.

The conference identified the following top-priority tasks: building roads to the relevant communities in Apsheronkiy Rayon and putting these roads in proper condition, and establishing stable communications between them and the rayon center and other centers of essential activity. However, poor performance by the republic's Gosstroy Stroyavtodor Association has caused

a great lag to develop in this sector. Efforts to provide electricity, gas, and water to the Altyagach-Khyzinskaya zone is proceeding at an equally slow pace. In view of the approaching date for moving people into their new homes, the Azglavenergo must accelerate work to provide electric power to the villages of Chisty Klyuch, Dizavar, and Perekyushkyul. The State Committee for Fuel has yet to begin work to supply gas to many villages where people are to be resettled. In view of the severe winters in these areas, the committee has been instructed to sharply step up the pace of work and to find the necessary materials and equipment to fully complete gasification of all communities on schedule. There are major complaints against the Ministry of Communications. Though it has begun providing telephone service to 11 villages, the work is proceeding very slowly.

The admirable initiative of the cities of Baku and Sumgait to build nearly 1,200 homes for those to be resettled on a sponsorship basis has not been backed up with practical deeds, with the exception of Narimanovskiy Rayon. It was also noted that Karadagskiy Rayon, Baku, and Shaumyanovskiy Rayon, Sumgait, have yet to deliver and assemble house trailers and frame-and-panel houses to accommodate 150 families.

The conference pointed out that the republic Gosstroy Azerbvodstroy [Azerbaijan Water Resources Construction] Association, and the Azneftemash [Azerbaijan Petroleum Industry Machinery] Research and Production Association are holding up the manufacture of 500 cabins, which are supposed to be completed in the first six months of the year. Ministries and departments must achieve a fundamental breakthrough in implementing the program, specified in the resolution for 1989-1990, for the construction of housing and social-sphere facilities.

It was pointed out that the republic State Planning Committee, the Ministry of Light Industry, and the Ministry of Local Industry are drawing up and implementing at a slow pace the program for developing production facilities to employ those to be resettled and are failing to coordinate this work with the timetable for moving people into the communities.

The Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources and the Azerbaydzhanggeologiya [Azerbaijan Geological] and Azselkhozvodoprovodstroy [Azerbaijan Agricultural Water Pipeline Construction] Associations were charged with the task of completing as soon as possible efforts to locate freshwater reserves in the Altyagach-Khyzinskaya zone, providing a stable water supply for its entire population, and building small-scale irrigation structures to provide water for farmland.

Attention was called to the need to develop in the aforementioned villages and communities a system of stores, public catering, and consumer and municipal services.

The conference was addressed by officials of the State Planning Committee, the State Agroindustrial Committee, the State Committee for Material and Technical Supply, the Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources, the Ministry of Consumer Services, the Ministry of Motor Transport, the Ministry of Local Industry, the Azerbaijan SSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems, the Azerbvodstroy and Azerbaydzhanggeologiya Associations, Azerittifak, and the Baku and Sumgait gorkoms, who gave assurances that they would take the requisite measures to fulfill the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers decree and make every effort to create normal living, working, and consumer-service conditions for those being resettled from Armenia.

The conference results were summed up by T. Kh. Orudzhev, secretary of the Azerbaijan CP Central Committee, who issued a reminder of the personal responsibility of every communist official for the prompt fulfillment of the program for the social and production development of Altyagach-Khyzinskaya zone of the Apsheronskiy Rayon.

A decision was taken to set up a staff to supervise operations and to resolve questions that arise in a timely and efficient manner.

#### **Draft Statutes of Kazakh 'Native Language' Society**

*18300705 Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA  
in Russian 4 Jun 89 p 3*

["Draft Statute of the Kazakh Republic 'Native Language' Society"]

[Text] In recent years the republic has been taking steps to improve interethnic relations. One of the most important aspects of this activity is the establishment of the Kazakh-Russian and Russian-Kazakh bilingualism, combined with unhindered development of the languages of other ethnic groups in the republic.

To improve native languages further, broadening their use and increasing the study of languages, the Institute of Linguistics, the Institute of Literature and Arts imeni M.O.Auezov, the Kazakh SSR Academy of Sciences' Institute of Uighur Culture, the Kazakh Writers' Union, the Kazakh Journalists' Union, the Kazakh SSR Ministry of Education and the Kazakh Culture Fund have proposed to establish the Kazakh Republic "Native Language" Society. We publish the draft statutes of that society. The draft will be publicly discussed for exactly one month after its publication. Please address all proposals and comments on the draft to the Kazakh SSR Academy of Sciences' Institute of Linguistics, 480021 Alma-Ata, Kurmangazy Street, 29.

The Kazakh SSR is a multi-ethnic republic.

The democratization of Soviet society that is being carried out during the perestroika period opens opportunities for broad economic and cultural development to all of the republic's nationalities. This process directly impacts the development of native languages, whose social functions are so diverse that the task of preserving them requires urgent measures and favorable conditions.

At the root of the concern for languages is the principle of true internationalism, which maintains that the harmonious development of nations is impossible in the absence of equal rights and opportunities for their languages and cultures. Concern for the language is concern for the nation's future, values and social activities, as well as for its preservation.

### 1. General Statutes

1. The Kazakh Republic "Native Language" Society (Society) is a voluntary organization comprised of various social groups in the republic's population and Kazakhs living outside the republic; it carries out its activities in accordance with the USSR Constitution, the Kazakh SSR Constitution, Soviet laws and the present statutes.

2. The Society's founders are the Institute of Linguistics, the Institute of Literature and Arts imeni M.O.Auezov, the Kazakh SSR Academy of Sciences' Institute of Uighur Culture, the Kazakh Writers' Union, the Kazakh Journalists' Union, the Kazakh SSR Ministry of Education and the Kazakh Culture Fund.

3. The Society consists of the central administration, grassroot organizations, local associations, study groups (amateur linguists), clubs (language specialists), etc. Local entities and subdivisions retain their organizational and financial independence and may open their own bank accounts.

4. The Society's activities are carried out in close cooperation with relevant state entities as well as public organizations, academic institutions and professional unions, based on the principles of internationalism, democracy, glasnost, self-management and creative participation by all members. The Society maintains business and professional ties with Turkic language and education centers, as well as with similar voluntary public associations in the USSR and abroad.

### II. Aims and Forms of the Society's Activities

The Society's activities are meant to ensure the widespread use of native languages, broaden their social functions, raise the level of fluency in the languages, develop national-Russian and Russian-national bilingualism and multilingualism, promote the study of the languages and help Kazakh and other languages fulfill their role as repositories of national values and means of educating and raising children at preschool centers, schools and higher education institutions.

6. The Society provides every form of assistance to the development of the native languages of all ethnic groups in the republic and helps those who speak other languages to learn Kazakh, the language of the indigenous nationality.

The Society enjoys all rights granted to public organizations under their statutes and programs. The Society's activities serve to implement Leninist directives in the area of nationalities and language policy and the Central Committee of the Kazakh Communist Party's and the Kazakh SSR Council of Ministers' March 5, 1987, decree on improving the study of the Kazakh and Russian languages in the republic.

7. The Society's principal goals are as follows:

a) to create conditions for all Kazakh SSR nationalities to use their native languages freely;

b) to raise the respect and social prestige of the native languages of the indigenous and other nationalities in the republic, adopting them for use at schools, as means of communication and development of ethnic cultures and as languages used in the press and for mass communications;

c) to help establish and strengthen the Kazakh-Russian and Russian-Kazakh bilingualism in the republic, as well as the appropriate varieties of national-Russian (such as German-Russian, Ukrainian-Russian, Uighur-Russian, Korean-Russian, Turkish-Russian, Kurdish-Russian, Greek-Russian and Dungan-Russian) and Russian-national bilingualism and multilingualism as the basis for interethnic relations;

d) to forge harmoniously developed and socially active individuals who would combine expertise in their native tongue and fluency in the language of interethnic communication and the languages of other nationalities with the appreciation of material and spiritual cultures of those ethnic groups and respect for their customs and traditions; to create conditions allowing everyone, and first of all the Kazakhs themselves, to attain true fluency in Kazakh.

e) to regularly provide necessary information on the true linguistic situation in the republic and to submit practical proposals on how to regulate it to the republic's authorities; the Society will develop the latter based on data from grassroot organizations, public opinion polls, results of relevant research projects, statistical and sociological centers and republican agencies;

f) to use all available methods and means, including the radio, television and the press, to promote Kazakh, Russian and other native languages;

g) to prepare and publish promptly the necessary scientific, methodological, educational and reference aids, specially developed programs, dictionaries, textbooks

for independent study, phrase books, visual aids and language courses on regular and video tape to help study the languages of Kazakhstan's nationalities;

h) to encourage and foster the general climate of friendship and mutual respect which would stimulate the voluntary and interested study of languages by various social groups based on their practical inner need;

i) to help set up synchronized translation services at public facilities where social, cultural and other events with the participation of representatives of different nationalities are held, and train interpreters, with Kazakh-Russian and Russian-Kazakh interpreters given priority;

j) to provide all possible assistance to preschool organizations, schools, industrial and vocational schools and higher education institutions in organizing instruction in Kazakh and to make sure that parents and students are able to exercise their Constitutional rights in the area of language;

k) to publish the Society's publication, the KAZAK TILI (KAZAKH LANGUAGE), making sure that it discusses issues related to the Kazakh language, biligualism and multilingualism, scientific terminology, scientific and literary translation, geographical names, the origins of the language and the history of its development and the implementation of language policy in the republic;

l) to publish books for the mass reader and to encourage people to study languages and upgrade their linguistic skills with the help of such programs as linguistic festivals, competitions, theme evenings and meetings, oral newspapers, round-table meetings, debates, discussions and folk games and rituals which would help develop speaking skills and make people more quick-witted in their language; and

m) to establish and ensure the effective functioning of the People's University of the Art of the Word, which should become a means of spreading the knowledge of the language among the masses in order to foster love for the native tongue and to increase its role in society.

### III. The Society's Members and Their Rights and Responsibilities

8. The following individuals and entities may join the Society:

a) USSR citizens who accept the Society's statutes and voluntarily participate in its activities;

b) citizens of foreign countries; and

c) state enterprises, agencies and organizations, research and educational institutions, professional unions, public organizations and cooperatives may become collective members of the Society.

9. USSR citizens living in areas without grassroots organizations of the Society may join the Society as associate members;

10. Membership in the Society is granted on a voluntary basis by the Society's grassroots organizations locally (at oblast and rayon centers, cities and on the countryside, at enterprises and offices and schools and other educational institutions) upon reviewing the membership application submitted to the Society.

11. The society's members receive a membership card and a pin. Collective members receive a membership certificate. Honorary members are given a diploma. The Society's council approves the design of the card, the pin, the certificate and the diploma.

12. The Society's members have the following rights:

a) to elect and to be elected to any organ of the Society;

b) to leave the Society voluntarily, informing the grassroots organization of their decision;

c) to participate in the organizational, propaganda, education and other activities of the Society depending on their resources and abilities;

d) to make speeches on relevant scientific and practical issues related to the Kazakh language, native languages, bilingualism and multilingualism, the history and origins of languages, etc. in the framework of the "Znaniye" and other societies, to work on publications and to participate in compiling dictionaries and reference materials, thus providing actual assistance to the Society;

e) to get professional assistance and advice of the Society's linguists on the methodology of study and instruction in the language, on the use of effective technical aids and modern speed methods of instruction and to get relevant literature, visual aids, etc.;

f) to submit requests and proposals to any of the Society's organs, to criticize their activity at meetings, conferences, in the press, on the radio and on television and to provide information to the Society's administration about local conditions; and

g) based on recommendations of the Society's oblast and rayon authorities, its outstanding members whose activity promotes the study of the native language and bilingualism will be periodically rewarded.

13. The Society's members have the following responsibilities:

a) to obey the Society's statutes and to take an active part in implementing its programs, as well as in all of its cultural, public, scientific and practical activities;

b) to be registered with one of the Society's grassroots organizations and regularly pay membership dues;

c) to carry out systematically the Society's mottos : "Learn Your Native Tongue (To Speak, Read and Write It Fluently) If You Don't Already Know It or Know It Poorly", "Teach the Native Tongue to Another Person Who Doesn't Already Know It or Knows It Poorly and Wants to Learn It" and "Pay More Attention to Teaching the Language to Children, for They Are the Future of the Nation";

d) to carry out requests of the Society's grassroots organization and higher authorities to work on a one-to-one basis with individuals wishing to learn or to upgrade their skills in their native language or any other language;

e) to help increase and diversify the use of native languages in the republic, making sure that they are used in industry, culture, science and technology and at pre-school centers, schools and higher education institutions;

f) to consider it their internationalist duty to learn the Russian language as a means of interethnic communication, to improve the national-Russian and Russian-national bilingualism and multilingualism in the republic and to raise the level of interethnic communication; and

g) to help attract new members into the Society.

#### IV. The Society's Organizational Structure

14. The highest organ of the Society is the republican "Kuryltay" congress, which gathers every three years. The Society's council sets representational norms and procedures for electing delegates for the Society's republican congress.

15. The Society is built along territorial and workplace lines. Its foundation is grassroots organizations established at offices, educational institutions or places of residence. The Society's grassroots entities form rayon, city and oblast organizations.

16. During periods between congresses the Society's affairs are managed by the council whose responsibilities include:

a) to direct the work of the Society's organizations to achieve aims defined by the statutes and to organize and monitor the implementation of the congress' decisions and the statutes' requirements;

b) to hear reports presented by the administration, the inspection commission, the executive secretary and other members of the council;

c) to approve the Society's plans and budgets;

d) to summarize and process proposals on language policies in the Kazah SSR and to submit them to government authorities; and

e) to review other issues related to the Society's activities.

17. The council's decisions are approved by a simple majority vote with at least two thirds of members present.

18. The Central Council consists of:

a) the Society's administration;

b) the inspection commission;

c) the president (unpaid), his deputy and executive secretary; and

d) other council members.

19. The Society's administration as an executive body manages the Society's activities during periods between council meetings; it is elected by the congress for a period of three years.

The administration's responsibilities include:

a) to manage the Society's activities in accordance with the decisions of the congress, the Society's statutes and the decisions of the council;

b) to organize people's universities, lecture tours, lectures, exhibitions, displays, competitions, contests, language festivals, charitable events, the publication of literature and promotional materials, to use the media, etc.;

c) to conduct scientific and practical conferences and seminars devoted to the task of popularizing native languages;

d) to establish methodological councils, centers and commissions on issues related to the Society's activities and to direct their activities;

e) to monitor financial and economic aspects of the Society's work; and

f) to prepare statutes and recommendations on various issues related to the Society's work and to submit them to the council for approval; to provide methodological and organizational assistance to grassroots organizations and local entities.

20. The Society's president (elected for no more than two consecutive terms) and his deputy and executive secretary regularly report on their activities at council meetings.



21. The inspection commission is responsible for monitoring the Society's activities; it is elected by the congress for a period of three years and monitors financial and property-related decisions of the administration, the condition of the Society's assets and handling thereof. It reports the results of its inspections to the congress. Inspection commission members can not hold positions in the administration.

#### **The Society's Finances**

22. The Society's activities are self-financed, with a partial initial subsidy from the republic to establish the Society.

23. The Society's revenue sources are as follows:

- a) entry fees and regular annual membership dues;
- b) voluntary contributions from trade unions and professional organizations and individuals;
- c) profits from the sale of the KAZAK TILI (KAZAKH LANGUAGE); and
- d) profits from courses and events organized by the People's University of the Art of the Word.

24. The Society's members pay entry fees amounting to 1 ruble and annual membership fees amounting to 6 rubles; membership fees can be waived for students, servicemen, retirees and associate members.

25. The Society's financial means can be allocated by the approved budget to:

- a) scientific, propaganda and educational work and various events;

- b) teaching, consulting and instruction for members working with the masses;

- c) staff salaries; and

- d) financial rewards to outstanding members of the Society.

26. The right to manage financial resources of the Society belongs to the administration; grassroot, city and oblast organizations contribute 25 percent of their revenues to the higher level organization to enable it to carry out programs in their region.

27. The society has a bank account at the Kazah SSR branch of the USSR Housing and Social Services Bank and a foreign currency account at the Kazah SSR branch of the USSR Vnesheconombank.

#### **VI. The Society's Legal Status**

28. The Society is a legal entity.

29. The society and its grassroot, city, rayon and oblast organizations bear no responsibility for each other's obligations.

30. The Society's administration has a stamp and a seal bearing its name.

31. The society has its own trademarks consisting of a logo and a pin. The trademarks are approved by the council and manufactured with the administration's approval.

32. The Society may be dissolved on the decision of the republican congress, which will make the final decision on the disposition of its property.